THE MAN OF NAZARETH

BY

FREDERICK LINCOLN ANDERSON, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION IN
NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1914

All rights reserved

Copyright, 1914
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Set up and electrotyped. Published October, 1914.

OCT 15 1914
©CL A387033

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED TO

My Father, Calusha Anderson,

FEARLESS PATRIOT

HONORED LEADER IN THE WORK OF CHRIST

MASTER AND EMINENT TEACHER OF THE ART OF PREACHING

BEARING CHOICE LITERARY FRUIT IN OLD AGE

AN ALTOGETHER WHOLESOME MAN

FOREWORD

In writing this book, I have had the ordinarily intelligent man constantly in mind, and have tried to answer some of the questions about Jesus, which have often arisen in his thinking but have rarely passed his lips. But while writing for the people, I have never forgotten the experts, a fact which they will quickly perceive, if they will do me the honor to penetrate to the core of the volume. I have tried to observe the rules of the critical game, have practically used only the first three gospels, and, even in them, have clearly differentiated the sources. I am ready to defend my position in the scholarly arena.

This book is not an investigation, but a statement of the results of fourteen years of research, put forth in popular form. There are therefore few critical arguments, few citations from scholarly authorities and not many quotations. Consequently, also, I have not failed to use the con-

clusions, so laboriously won, for the quickening of faith and courage. As the readers will soon see, I belong to no party, but have attempted to investigate independently, to make a fearless search for truth, and have drawn the picture of Jesus which the facts, as I see them, give me. My whole attitude has been historical rather than theological. The final result will probably fully satisfy nobody, and that may be the best test of its real worth.

This is not a Life of Jesus, nor a summary of his teachings, nor a mere character sketch. It is rather a treatment of the most important problems about Jesus and his career, and that so far as possible from the viewpoint of Jesus himself. I am aware of the boldness of the attempt, but feel that we may reverently penetrate to the very heart of Jesus. Indeed, it is doubtful if we can truly know him in any other way.

It should be understood that Chapter I is merely preliminary, inserted to give a general view of the subject and to create an appetite for something more definite and detailed. In my own mind, Chapters III and IV constitute the principal contribution of the book, and are the real

reason for its publication, though Chapters VII and IX may possibly rank with them.

Of course, it would be impossible for me to give a list of all the books which have influenced my thought on this great subject. The following authors should, however, be mentioned as peculiarly responsible for the final form and indeed some of the phrases of the book. For the first chapter, I am much indebted to a sermon on The Light of the World by my friend, Rev. James A. Francis of Boston, and to Harnack's *Christianity and History*. My greatest helpers for the most important chapters were Von Soden in his *Die Wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu*, and Holtzmann in his *Das Messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*. For the chapter on the teaching, Clarke's *The Ideal of Jesus* proved valuable. For the discussion of the character, I must mention Bushnell's *The Character of Jesus*, still inspiring though from the older point of view, and a little book, published since I began to write, Fosdick's *The Manhood of the Master*, which is sure to prove of lasting worth.

For kindly and yet thorough criticism, my thanks are due to two of my colleagues, Professor

Richard M. Vaughan and Mr. James P. Berkeley, and, especially, to my father and mother, who have also labored in many other ways to help me in the production of this book.

FREDERICK LINCOLN ANDERSON.

NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.
April 30, 1914.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Power Behind the History	1
II.	The Situation in Which Jesus Found Himself	23
III.	How did Jesus Come to Believe Himself the Messiah?	34
IV.	How Jesus Handled Messianism	60
V.	How Jesus Handled Legalism	97
VI.	Jesus' Positive Teaching	111
VII.	Jesus' Work and His View of its Future	137
VIII.	The Character of Jesus	166
IX.	The Finality of Jesus	209
Appendix		219
Index		223

THE MAN OF NAZARETH

THE MAN OF NAZARETH

CHAPTER I

THE POWER BEHIND THE HISTORY

Almost two thousand years ago there appeared a man, who changed the course of human history, who, above any other person living or dead, dominates the thought and feeling of our modern world. The most intelligent and progressive part of mankind date their letters, count time, from the year of his birth.

Yet herein lies the deepest mystery, for he had none of the external advantages which men think necessary to such vast influence. He came of a despised race. He was born of the peasant class. He lived nearly all his life in an obscure town of a frontier province. He never had what either his Graeco-Roman or Jewish contemporaries would have called an education. It cannot be proved that he ever read any book except the Old Testament, or that he ever studied the philosophers of Greece. He grew up under

the blighting shadow of a fanatical and bigoted religiosity. He never traveled a hundred miles from his home; nor, until his fate was practically sealed, did he ever see any country other than his own. He had no money or any desire to make money. He had no powerful or cultivated friends. He eschewed politics. He championed no popular social reforms. He stirred up no class conflict. He never led an army, or wrote a book, or founded a school. He never invoked the aid of art, music or literature. He either was shut out from all the avenues that in the experience of men lead to greatness, or he refused to use them. His whole public activity extended over little more than three years, quite possibly two, perhaps only one. He was only thirty-five or six at most when he died. His teachings antagonized the religious traditions, the cherished political hopes of his people, the interests of the higher classes, and all the ingrained selfishness of humanity. He continually disappointed his followers and even his dearest friends. He was finally betrayed by one of his own disciples, and was crucified between two robbers, suffering the most shameful death known to that age.

And now the mystery begins. He had hardly stepped out into public life, when all felt that some extraordinary person had come upon the scene. In a few weeks he had focused the attention of the nation on himself. Multitudes hung upon his lips. The leading men of the Jews soon found it necessary to journey to Galilee to oppose this young man, who was like to steal their authority over night. The crowds began to think him another Elijah or Jeremiah, and even to wonder sometimes whether he might not be the Messiah. Contrary to rule, his most familiar friends, his daily table-companions, were more impressed than those who knew him less intimately. They accepted him as their teacher, prophet and king. They found no stain of sin, no shadow of impurity in him. They hailed him as Messiah, although he was so different from what they expected the Messiah to be, and by that name they meant nothing less than that he was God's special Representative on earth, the Founder of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Bringer of Salvation and the Final Judge of Men. After his death, it did not seem unnatural to them that he should have risen from the dead,

nor incongruous with what they knew of him that he should be sitting at God's right hand. They confessed him as the Good Shepherd, the Light of the World, the Prince of Life, the Son of God. They said that they had beheld his glory, glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. And soon a multitude of Jews and heathen, wise and fools, declared that he was the strength of their life, the Savior of their souls, and that they had seen the glory of God in his face. "This fact, which is as plain as day," says Professor Harnack, "is unique in history, and demands that the personality which lies behind it should be regarded as unique."

These wonderful ascriptions of an almost divine power and glory were soon matched by the facts of history. The impulse of this powerful personality began to make itself felt throughout the world. Within two months after his death, three thousand men and women enthusiastically joined his cause in the very city in which he had been executed as a criminal. His influence extended in ever widening circles. It leaped the barrier of a narrow Judaism and entered upon a career of conquest in the Gentile world. His

followers gladly suffered imprisonment, torture and death for his sake. The bitterest persecutions only fanned the flame and scattered the conflagration. The spiritual enthusiasm spread like a prairie fire till the whole Roman Empire was ablaze. The ablest and most thorough of the early persecutors was struck down, and became the most devoted of his followers, the most successful missionary of the faith. Within thirty-five years of Jesus' death, a Roman emperor was burning Christians at the stake in his own gardens in the distant capital of the world. Jesus had against him the power, the culture, the religion, the pride, the self-interest, the prejudices, the traditions and all the selfish passions of the greatest, the richest, the most magnificent civilization that man up to that time had produced. But after a two hundred and fifty year contest in which all these tremendous forces fought with the energy of despair, the Roman Empire at last surrendered. The Galilean peasant had conquered. Emperors, at least nominally Christian, occupied the seat of Nero and Diocletian. The completeness of the triumph is strikingly evidenced by the facts that the priceless marbles

which once adorned the throne-room of the ruthless persecutor, Domitian, on the Palatine, are today the pride of the Church of Jesus in the valley below the Capitoline, and that the most magnificent Christian cathedral in the world stands in the very gardens once lighted by the fires of Nero's victims.

By simply associating them with himself, Jesus changed the humble fishermen of Galilee from ordinary men into the leaders of a new and world-wide movement, and has made them famous for all time. More people read Peter, John and Matthew today than read Homer, Virgil or Shakespeare. We call our children John, James, Philip and Thomas, and the name of the mother of Jesus is the commonest of all. A Johnson has been President of the United States. An Andrewson is writing these lines. The Jamesons, the Matthews, the Phillipses, the Thompsons and the Petersons are a great host. These obscure disciples are honored by cities like St. John, St. Paul and St. Petersburg; while the most beautiful and stately buildings of Christendom bear their names, St. Peter's at Rome, St. Paul's in London and St. John the Divine in New York.

It is interesting to note that these names are beginning to invade India, China and Japan.

No character of the past exerts so direct and vast an influence *on the present world* as Jesus. The movement to which his personality gave the initial impulse has outlived all contemporary governments, philosophies and social systems, has endured all the vicissitudes of nineteen centuries, has crossed all the oceans, has invaded every continent, is strongest in the world's foremost nations and never was more intelligent, more spiritual, more powerful or more hopeful than it is today.

One of the most remarkable features of Christianity is her faculty of self-criticism and self-purification. In this she seems almost to reproduce the functions of a living thing in throwing off what is useless and effete. The impulse and the power are from within. Thus she renewed herself in the Reformation, and again in the Wesleyan revival. In fact the process is continually going on, not only in the body as a whole, but in each living section of it. Outworn forms are cast aside, ancient traditions fade, doctrines are modified. Christianity is always digging deeper

foundations for her faith. The apologetic which once satisfied has begun to seem superficial and inadequate. Much she once thought essential, she now sees was not the essence after all. Ever deeper, deeper, deeper she goes, until she founds her faith on the granite rock of reality. This means progress and true growth. It is not the sacrifice of faith, but a truer valuation and appreciation of it.

Christianity is also constantly broadening her outlook. More and more she sees with Paul that all things are hers, because she is Christ's and Christ is God's. She breaks the shell of Judaism, she travels from Asia to Europe. She survives the dissolution of the Roman Empire through the conversion of the northern barbarians. She finds herself able to cut loose from the papacy, and at last from alliance with the state. She crosses the ocean to a new world. Finally she begins to take in earnest the missionary call and the missionary hope, and is now seeing what is really the beginning of a universal break-up of heathenism. She recognizes the opportunity for intensive as well as extensive growth. She lays claim to the secular as well as to the religious

sphere. She takes all life as her empire, and looks forward to the day, when not only the inner life and the home, but business, politics, education, art, music, literature and the whole social order shall be Christian. Thus she strengthens and nourishes her hope. Her visions grow larger and more glorious with the ongoing years. Her task seems ever greater and more fundamental and more essential to the good of men. She realizes herself as the Light of the World.

She is the surer of this, for she finds in herself an amazing ability to adapt herself to new situations. Beginning as a simple, unreasoning Jewish faith, she was able to present herself to an age dominated by Stoicism and Neoplatonism, and to wear what seemed to the men of that day a familiar face. When Scholasticism came in, she was a Scholastic, and at the Renaissance still knew how to be in fashion. So the history has gone on until, in our own age, she seems to be thriving on biblical criticism, the conceptions of the new science and the philosophy of evolution. And yet she is always herself. In all these different forms, she is seeking and finding something to round out and complete her truth.

Fashions in philosophy come, and fashions in philosophy go, but she goes on forever. From each fashion she gains some advantage, but casts the fashions aside, when they no longer help her to make herself known to men. Just now she is getting ready to emphasize her pragmatic side; and she is strong there. She feels sure that no discovery of truth can ever disconcert or harm her, for she knows that in her experience of union with Jesus and communion with God she has touched the rock bottom of life. Thus she is certain of ultimate victory. She knows that when the world gets through with all its experiments, it is bound to come back to her and her experience of God through Jesus.

Our whole point is this, that all this power of self-purification, all this capacity for profounder insight and growing vision, all this adaptability to human hearts and minds in every age, all this stir of hope and certainty of faith, in short, all this actuality and potency of life she constantly refers to the spirit and power of Jesus working in her. In him and him alone she recognizes the source and impulse of her vital energy.

Jesus' influence on our own age may also be

seen in the fact that he lays hold of men today just as truly and wonderfully as he laid hold of Paul on the road to Damascus, or Augustine in the garden at Milan. These marvels never cease, and science and sociology are at last taking them seriously. Professor James in his *Varieties of Religious Experience* and Begbie in his *Twice Born Men* have called the world's attention again to this common, world-wide phenomenon. Such conversions occur in Chicago and Pekin, in London and Madras, in Madagascar and New Zealand, in Greenland and on the Congo; and not only among the degenerates of our own civilization and those sunk in heathen superstition, but also among the educated and prosperous. I sometimes contemplate rivaling Begbie with a book on *Twice Born Respectables.* I have a superabundance of material for it. But Jesus lays hold of John and Andrew none the less surely than he does of Paul. Though in such cases the experience is quieter and not calculated to summon and fix the attention of men, yet the life is just as truly moulded and shaped, just as thoroughly, though not as strikingly, changed. There are millions of Christians of this type,

and they do not yield in devotion or faith to those of the other sort.

With one voice they all testify, men of every temperament, of every age, of every race and of every social condition, that Jesus has drawn them to himself, has made them moral victors, has led them into communion with the Father, has given unity to their lives, has furnished them with a new and infinitely worthy motive and purpose, has filled them with love to their fellows, has inspired in them the ideals of a new humanity in a new society, and has put into their hearts the faith that overcomes the world.

This life relation with Jesus his followers count their greatest blessing, their most sacred treasure, the unspeakable gift. And, when occasion presents itself, they offer an indisputable proof of the value they set upon it. "All that a man hath will he give for his life," is an ancient proverb, and it is nearly the truth. But there are some things more precious than life, and this blessing which Jesus gives his followers is one of them. Rather than seem untrue to him the Giver, today, as during all the centuries of the past, they will endure supreme tortures and death in its most

dreadful forms. Doughty, the English University explorer of Arabia, so radical in his views that many old-fashioned saints would almost deny him the Christian name, spent years absolutely alone among the fanatical Musselmen, but, unlike other western travelers in those lands, he scorned to hide the fact that he was a Christian, and openly approached the very walls of Mecca. His life was in daily danger. The horrid bigotry of the Arabs made every night's sleep a peril, and yet, as he says, he could never make up his mind "to deny the dear name of Jesus," even when threatened with imminent and instant death.

The Christian boys of Uganda in Africa preferred to burn at the stake rather than renounce their lately found Savior, and they died singing amid the flames. The followers of Jesus in Madagascar allowed themselves to be thrown over precipices to the rocks below, although one compromising word would have saved them. Whole families of humble Russian peasants, after years of harassing persecution, have tramped the thousand miles to Siberia across the barren plains in the face of bitter winds and, after suffering all

privations, have starved to death in proof of the value they set upon the light and life which Jesus had brought to their souls. And in our century, ten thousand Chinese men, women and children laid down their lives in the anti-christian uprisings in China. One word of repudiation of Jesus, only a word, would have given them life, but that word they would not speak. The allied troops found the whited bones of hundreds of Christians in the palace gardens of Prince Chuang in Pekin, mute and glorious witnesses of the power and blessing of Jesus in our own age. Indeed, there is no living king, emperor or leader, who today could summon so large a host of devoted volunteers, ready to live or die for him, as Jesus.

The power of Jesus in society continually increases. He somehow created a new moral and spiritual atmosphere in the world and a new type of human character. Sins, that stalked unashamed before he lived and died, have indeed survived, but they have never recovered caste, and some of them are now almost unknown in Christian lands. In Jesus mankind made a distinct moral advance and has ever since, despite all waverings and backslidings, lived on a higher

plane. Lecky has well said, "The simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists. In the character of its Founder, the church has an enduring principle of regeneration." With Jesus' insistence on the seriousness of life and his appreciation of the infinite value of a single human soul, there was ushered in a new civilization, rightly called Christian. With the elevation of woman and the passion for purity, both originating with him, there was created the Christian home. Just before Jesus was born, liberty died in the Graeco-Roman world, but he gave it a new reason for existence, and, more than any other, he is responsible for the modern revival of democracy. It is his spirit, which has abolished slavery and duelling, which frowns on cruelty and oppression, which is behind all the forces of justice, mercy and brotherhood, which is making unrelenting war on all the forces of evil. He is at the bottom of much of our social unrest. His spirit stirs us to bring in the kingdom of righteousness and joy and peace. He has entered into the warp and woof of our

social life. As Bushnell says, "It were easier to untwist all the beams of light in the sky and to separate and expunge one of the primary colors, than to get the character of Jesus, which is the true gospel, out of the world."

His utterly unexpected triumphs in recent years nourish the faith of his followers that the day is approaching when he shall rule universally in the hearts of men. His cause seems to be gaining an almost irresistible momentum. His final victory is changing from being a matter of religious faith into being a matter of rational probability. These advances are inextricably intertwined with selfish motives, and disappoint those idealists who do not understand that the history of all progress is like that of a flowing tide, whose new high water marks alternate with ebbings. Recently the incoming waves have reached points hitherto unknown. A universal, idealistic, democratic, essentially Christian movement seems to be encircling the globe, breaking out here and there only to be suppressed. All mature observers rejoice in the new high records of progress, and understand that the retrogressions are merely temporary. The next wave is bound

to go higher still.[1] The dethronement of that old serpent, Abdul Hamid, by the Young Turks in 1909 and the reign of the original Committee of Order and Progress in the Ottoman Empire was an event of the highest and most cheering significance. The national rising against despotism in effete Persia and the proof that thousands there were willing to die, as they said, "for the sweet name of liberty," was beyond the faith of the most confirmed optimists. To her shame England has helped Russia put out that light, but Persia and the world can never be the same again. The appeal of the Japanese Minister of Education to the Christian missionaries to help solve the moral problems of the Empire was plainly a turn in the tide. Most amazing of all was the mighty change in China. The West is still dumbfounded at the thought of a great Chinese Republic, and most fittingly its provisional President was a Christian. Who could have believed it ten years ago? Today the Crescent flaps feebly in the breeze behind its last

[1] Since these sentences were in print, the general European war of 1914 has broken out. The author, however, on mature reflection sees no reason for changing the wording. Often the greatest ebb precedes the greatest flow.

breastworks in Europe. The old, corrupt Mohammedanism is sinking to irremediable ruin. Whether the Young Turks can create a new Mohammedanism, more in accord with Christian ideals and the thought of Jesus, remains to be seen. It is the only hope the Levantine world has of avoiding Christian domination. All this is partial, stained with sordidness, baseness and blood, subject to temporary reverses, and yet it is a wave of idealism, the pulse of a new life, the splendid promise of a better world, and its ultimate source is Jesus. His teaching and his spirit irresistibly press the nations forward. He is marching on.

All this accords with the philosophy of our time. We do not minimize the influence of ideas, slowly trickling down from the few into the minds of the many until they become a part of life and sometimes decide the fate of nations and of ages. Nor do we forget those strange, almost inexplicable mass movements of human minds, which presage new epochs. Still the truth remains, and without it no history can be rightly written, that the sharp turning points in human

progress have been due to great events and the rise of great personalities.

The political evolution naturally led up to Napoleon, but when he unexpectedly appeared, he changed the whole course of the time, remade the map of Europe, and brought in a new era. With the French Revolution and Napoleon, history turned a sharp corner. The world could never move along in the old groove again after the execution of Louis XVI. and the battle of Austerlitz.

The Spanish-American war was not much of a war, but it has had the profoundest influence on our national life. Nothing could have been more unforeseen than the battle of Manila, yet it woke this country on that first of May to a new vision, a new duty and a new career. If an intelligent American had gone to sleep in 1897 and awaked in 1899, he could not have believed that one brief year could have produced so great a change. This little war was a momentous event. It made the United States a world power, and has brought about a new national feeling which has been and will be of tremendous import.

In the middle of the last century Germany

was a chaos of mutually jealous states, but Bismarck rose, unified them into the strongest military empire of our time, and gave the German people the stimulus, which makes them today everywhere feared as business rivals. His iron will, his masterly diplomacy, his courage to fight at the right time, his ability to inspire a whole race, in short, this one man permanently altered the course of European history, and no one doubts that his mighty personality, however many helpers he may have had, was primarily alone responsible.

What was it that changed the history of the world in the first century?

It would perhaps be fair to our fathers to say that most of them answered, Christianity, and by this they usually meant a certain system of truths, which they regarded as then for the first time revealed and proclaimed. A great deal of stress was laid on the originality of the revelation as proof of its divine character. But the scholars went to work on this proposition, and they have shown that many New Testament ideas were derived from the Old Testament, that there are the most striking parallels to many more in the uncanonical prechristian Jewish literature,

that Greek, Persian, Indian and Chinese sages had had some of the same thoughts, that somewhat contemporary mysteries had rites and ideas surprisingly like the Christian. Thus critical investigation seemed to have disproved the uniqueness of Christianity, and some Christians, much disturbed, began to doubt whether anything very remarkable had happened in the first century after all.

But when the new scientific historical school came in, they perceived that in spite of all that had been shown, something of an epoch-making character had occurred in the first century. They traced Christianity back and they found that it had its source in a great personality. Christianity is the most powerful moral and religious force in the world today, and has been, so far as Europe is concerned, for nineteen centuries. Such a movement must have an adequate cause, and no other adequate cause has ever been discovered except the personality of Jesus. Therefore he must be great enough to produce this age-long and world-wide effect. There are limits beyond which radical criticism cannot go and remain scientific. So Professor Schmiedel, one

of the foremost radical critics, said to me in Zürich, "We may nibble away at the character of Jesus, but we must at least leave a sufficient initial impulse for this great and living thing called Christianity."

The personality of the Man of Nazareth, then, is the power behind the Christian history.

CHAPTER II

THE SITUATION IN WHICH JESUS FOUND HIMSELF

Two great factors formed the background of life in the first century, Greek civilization and Roman rule. Alexander had carried the Greek language and Greek culture to the Orient and his great empire had virtually become a Greek world. Even the remoter districts were more or less strongly influenced. Over this Greek world, Rome had extended its political sway. Men of our time are not likely to overestimate the power and efficiency of the Roman government at this period. It knit the various countries around the Mediterranean into one great compact body politic, whose vigorous heart beat in Italy and sent the impulses of its authority to the furthest boundaries.

When Jesus began his ministry, Palestine had been virtually Roman for nearly a hundred years, and composed part of the eastern frontier of the Empire. Judea and Samaria for more

than twenty years had constituted a Roman province of the second or third class under a Roman governor, called a procurator. Galilee and Perea for more than thirty years had been ruled by Herod Antipas, the tetrarch, a son of Herod the Great, but he was a mere underling of the Romans. The northeastern part of Palestine had been for the same period under similar conditions the dominion of Philip, the tetrarch, a half-brother of Antipas.

The government of these rulers, while despotic and often arbitrary, was on the whole firm and just, and left much power in the hands of Jewish magistrates and courts. For more than twenty years, there had been practically uninterrupted peace, and Palestine consequently was populous, busy and rich. Jesus taught during a time of business prosperity. This was especially true of Galilee.

The Jews of Jesus' time were much like the orthodox Jews of today, except that they were neither poor nor persecuted. Their two greatest interests were religion and money-making. Jerusalem was the religious and political center; the seat of the temple, the Sanhedrin and the

priesthood. It was ecclesiastical, formal, conservative, proud and intolerant. Galilee was freer in its religious and social life, capable of initiative and self-sacrifice, bold, courageous, unsophisticated, unspoiled. The people to whom Jesus appealed were uncompromising monotheists, had no doubts of God, and were equally sure of the divine origin of the Old Testament. These things were taken for granted in all his teaching. His situation and task were radically different in these respects from ours.

Though a frontier province, Palestine had many Greek cities, and was truly in the life of the Empire. Yet the Jews as a whole, though inevitably influenced by Gentile life and thought, most of them indeed speaking Greek, resolutely set themselves against everything Gentile, as do the orthodox Jews of today, and so far as possible lived in a world of their own.

This little Jewish world was divided by parties. Of these, the Sadducees were the rich, aristocratic, rationalistic, worldly party, made up principally of priests and their retainers, with the High Priest at their head. Their sympathies were with the Romans. They were a small, compact,

powerful coterie, in political control at Jerusalem and in the Sanhedrin, but not largely influential with the people, or numerous outside the capital. They opposed the Pharisees doctrinally on traditionalism, the life after death and predestination. Apart from his last week in Jerusalem, this party is comparatively unimportant for the life and thought of Jesus. Its interest was in political power and wealth.

The Pharisees formed a fraternity of something over six thousand members, and were the nucleus of an influence which dominated the religious life of the whole nation. They were the true leaders of the people, and, on that very account, though a minority in the Sanhedrin, practically dictated the action of that body. A Pharisee was one who set himself to obey all the prescriptions of the law, plus the endless interpretations of the scribes, which they held to be of equal validity. These interpretations referred particularly to the law of clean and unclean (especially to the items concerning food, and contact with unclean persons), to the Sabbath, and to tithes, fasting and prayers. Obedience was the soul of piety. The law and its external perform-

ance filled the whole mental and spiritual horizon, and discouraged every attempt to realize communion with God or to nourish sympathy with men. Ethics was practically sacrificed to externalized religion. Pride covered the Pharisees as a garment, but they were not esoteric. They made every effort to teach the law to all Israelites, in school, in synagogue and by the wayside. They compassed sea and land to make one proselyte. They earnestly longed for the golden day when Israel would keep the law and the traditions. The whole interest of the Pharisee was in law-keeping. His only care in politics was to secure a situation favorable to legalism. The Pharisees were a religious and not a political party.

The Zealots would not have called themselves a distinct party, being, like the rest of the people, admirers of the Pharisees. They were principally Galileans, and believed that it was a shame for Israel, the elect nation, destined to rule the world, to pay taxes or bow down to a heathen power. They were ready to revolt against Rome at any time, waiting only for a leader. They did not expect to be able to overcome the world empire alone, but thought that if they began the in-

surrection, God would send the Messiah with his supernatural powers to their aid. The Sadducees and the more conservative Judean Pharisees frowned on these ideas, but the common people and the less important Pharisees secretly favored them, until Zealotism plunged the nation into the war of 66–70. When the fighting began, Galilee offered the most stubborn resistance to Vespasian, and Galileans were the last desperate defenders of Jerusalem and Masada. It is easily seen how hazardous this Zealot feeling rendered Jesus' Messianic work in Galilee, and consequently Zealotism, which was a robust nationalism, is one of the main factors in the situation.

The Messianic hope was active in Palestine in the time of Jesus. It was derived almost wholly from the Old Testament, but there were many different opinions as to what sort of person the Messiah would be and just what he would do. Possibly the best general statement is that the Jews expected the Messiah to be God's special Representative on earth, the Bringer of Salvation, the Founder of the Kingdom of God, and the final Judge of Men. Each party would desire, however, to interpret these phrases and

modify them in its own way. Yet the people generally expected the Messiah to be a human, Davidic King, to destroy Israel's enemies, especially Rome, to judge the world, to establish a universal Jewish empire with Jerusalem as its capital, and thereafter to reign in righteousness and peace. The Sadducees desired no Messiah. The Pharisees waited for God to take the initiative, on condition that Israel kept the law. The Zealots would take the initiative themselves, expecting God to reward their faith by sending the Messiah to help them. Jesus satisfied none of these expectations.

There existed in Judaism an apocalyptic literature, which professed to unveil to the oppressed people of God the future and the unseen world. The books which especially interest us are the Books of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Apocalypse of Baruch, and Fourth Ezra. These are at once the most apocalyptic and the richest in allusions to the Messiah. They are all founded on the Book of Daniel and similar passages in the Old Testament prophets. They give us the apocalyptic view of the Messiah, as a pre-existent, supernatural, semi-divine being, sent by God

from heaven to be the Savior of Israel from its enemies and the final Judge of Men. This is quite different from what might be called the popular political view, the idea of a Davidic king and conqueror, born as a man among men. The greatest historical question about Jesus is his relation to these two radically different conceptions.

Although they have some phrases in common, it is improbable that Jesus or the earlier apostles had read these books. Many of the apocalyptic ideas were undoubtedly more or less common among the people, and from their speech they get into both the Gospels and the apocalyptic literature. The books themselves probably sprang from small sects rather than from the main stock of Pharisaic Judaism.

The common people from whom Jesus and the apostles came, and with whom they had most to do, were not Sadducees. Neither were they Pharisees. They greatly admired the Pharisees and took them for the highest types of piety. The majority did the best they could and plodded after the Pharisaic leaders, but a great many were too busy or too poor to devote their lives

to keeping endless regulations. On account of their failure to make even a serious attempt at the legalistic ideal, these people were discouraged, and many became "sinners," i. e., men who made no pretense of keeping the law. To these men Jesus offered his easier yoke and his blessed rest. He was the friend of the "sinners."

Among the Jews of Jesus' day were many truly pious people of generally Pharisaic type, but hardly with the Pharisaic emphasis on legalism. They were simple in their thought, nourished their life on the Old Testament scriptures and lived in communion with God. They have been called "The Devout." They were really Old Testament Jews, somewhat influenced by contemporary thought, and they looked hopefully and prayerfully for the consolation of Israel. They formed the special seed-plot of Christianity. It was in such devout homes that the Baptist, Jesus, and most of the Twelve grew up.

So we have the Sadducees representing worldliness; the Pharisees, legalism; the Zealots, nationalism and revolution; the Messianic hope and the apocalyptic dreams; and the common people, distressed and discouraged, and yet in expecta-

tion of some help from God. Pharisaic legalism, Zealot revolutionary nationalism, and the Messianic hope constituted the problem for Jesus, and our principal interest is in seeing how he handled these elements of the situation.

And now John the Baptist comes, a voice crying in the wilderness, a fresh breath of the ozone of heaven's hills in a stagnant world, a prophet in word and deed. He proclaims the Messianic kingdom at hand, declares that the Messiah will soon appear for judgment, and bids all men repent. The people were profoundly moved, "the Messianic hope revived with a start, and the whole structure of Pharisaic legalism began to crack and crumble." For John, with amazing insight and boldness, demanded more than external piety, more than a stricter legalism. He insisted on a real change of mind and heart towards God, towards sin, towards fellow men, i. e., towards life itself. It would not do to appeal to racial privilege and say, "We have Abraham for our Father." God could make children of Abraham out of these stones. Nothing but genuine repentance would suffice. It seemed as if Amos or Isaiah had risen from the dead. The

people came in thousands to hear and to receive the baptism of repentance, by which they symbolized their burial of the old life and their resurrection to the new. But the Sadducees in their cynicism and the Pharisees in their self-righteous pride stood aloof from the man, who regarded them as a generation of vipers, fit only for the wrath to come. Just as little did John please the Zealots, who waited in vain for a call to arms amid the exhortations to repentance. It was a great revival of genuine morality and pure religion. Jesus could not stand indifferent. He came and was baptized.

(NOTE.—At this point many will wish to turn to the Appendix, which furnishes a brief and comprehensive survey of the principal divisions and events in the Life of Jesus.)

CHAPTER III

HOW DID JESUS COME TO BELIEVE HIMSELF THE MESSIAH?

ALTHOUGH a matter of some doubt, the better opinion seems to be that the Messianic hope was strong among the Jews during the boyhood of Jesus. At least we know that with the preaching of John the Baptist it became the center of national interest. But before that event, when Jesus was ten or twelve years old, and a remarkably bright boy for his age, Judas of Galilee had risen in rebellion against Rome at the time of the taxing under Quirinius, and, according to Josephus, had thereby inaugurated the patriotic movement. His followers developed into the well known Zealot party of resolute nationalists, who thought that if they only took the initiative against the Romans, God would send the Messiah to their aid. This rebellion threw all Galilee into a ferment and the issues must have been pondered in every home. The Old Testament

pictures of the Golden Age, the theocratic king and the Servant of Jehovah were seen in livelier colors, and the family at Nazareth could not have been unmoved. In fact, the whole country fell to discussing the matter. Among the Pharisees especially, various ideas emerged, for we must remember that, while in those days conduct was exactly prescribed, faith was free and theology, outside a few leading ideas, was very much in the fog. While then in Jesus' boyhood the Messianic hope was vague and confused, various parties vacillating between different ideas of just what the Messiah would do, and just what sort of person he would be, it is still probably correct to say, as we have said before, that the common denominator of all these opinions may be expressed thus: The Messiah would be God's special Representative on earth, the Bringer of Salvation, the Founder of the Kingdom of Heaven and the final Judge of Men. Each party, of course, would wish to add, define, explain and modify, but this formula could express every view. *And this Messiah Jesus thought himself to be.* Of course, he too had his ideas of the meaning of these terms, especially, salvation and the kingdom

of God, but that is another story, which will be told in subsequent chapters.

In spite of all that can be said against it, the fact stands fast that Jesus thought himself the Messiah, and that in the sense above expressed. The gospel passages which go to make up the proof are numerous, but we will mention only a few of the more important, and will try at the same time to find out how early in life the idea entered Jesus' mind.

We know that he believed himself to be the Messiah at the final Jewish trial, when the High Priest asked him the direct question, "Art thou the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed?" Think for a moment of the solemnity of that scene. Jesus stood at last before the supreme court of Israel; the High Priest, the political and religious head of the nation, who might well be looked upon as the mouthpiece of the whole people, asked the question. In asking it, he put Jesus under oath to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. On the answer, Jesus knew full well, depended his life or death. But he did not equivocate, he did not explain, he did not hesitate. He answered simply and firmly,

"I am," and "what is more," he added, "one day you, who judge me now, will appear before my Messianic judgment seat." Any possible remaining doubt that Jesus thought himself the Messiah in his last week of life is swept away, when we remember the Messianic Triumphal Entry four days before this confession, and the fact that a few hours after it the Sanhedrists charged Jesus before Pilate with claiming to be the Messianic King, which, of course, with the Roman Governor was nothing less than high treason. Pilate in accord with this charge placed above Jesus' head upon the cross the words, "This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King (the Messianic King) of the Jews." The proof is complete.

We now go back into the ministry, possibly nearly a year, to Cæsarea Philippi. Jesus has been journeying with his disciples through non-Jewish lands, and near this practically heathen capital, he asks them the momentous question, "Whom say ye that I am?" When Peter, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary replies, "Thou art the Messiah," Jesus accepts the answer with joy. "Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jonah," he says, "for flesh and blood has not revealed it to

thee, but my Father, who is in heaven." These words ring as certainly as the confession before the Sanhedrin.

But we can trace this thought in Jesus' mind to the time of the temptation, in the very beginning of his ministry. It is a fundamental error to see in Satan's "If thou art the Son of God" any suggestion of doubt, as though the temptation to Jesus were to doubt his Messiahship. Rather, to avoid ambiguity, we might well translate, "Since thou art the Son of God," do so and so.[1] Jesus' Messiahship is taken for granted, it is made the very basis of temptation. The matter decided in that hour was not whether Jesus was the Messiah or not, but what sort of Messiah this Galilean peasant would choose to be, what should be the fundamental principles of his Messianic activity.

Can we go yet further up the stream of Jesus' life and still find this thought? Doubtless. The principal thing in the vision at the baptism is the divine message, "Thou art my beloved Son, in

[1] Just as it might be said to an American President with reference to some bill, "If you are the President of the United States, send in your veto," and this would mean, "Since you are the President of the United States—and you are—send in your veto."

whom I am well pleased." The first words would bring to any Jewish mind the second Psalm, "Yet I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will tell the decree: Jehovah said unto me, Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee." This is the theocratic king; and the Servant of Jehovah of Isaiah 42: 1 would probably be suggested by the second phrase, "in whom I am well pleased." To Jesus, this word then could mean nothing less and nothing else than, "Thou art the Messiah," the Messianic king, "my Servant sent to bring Jacob again to me, and to be my salvation unto the ends of the earth." (Isaiah 49: 5, 6)

But did he think himself the Messiah before his baptism? We enter here upon more debatable ground, but we must, I think, say, "yes." Two considerations lead us to this conclusion. In Matthew's account, John the Baptist is represented as saying to Jesus as he presents himself to be baptized, "I have need to be baptized of thee and comest thou to me?" John senses in Jesus his moral and spiritual superior, just as we are often aware of standing in the presence of men stronger, abler, purer than we are. With

Jesus before him, John's own moral need painfully obtrudes itself on his conscience. He feels that he would like, himself, to be baptized by this one mightier and better than he. But what does Jesus say? Does he tell John that he has made a mistake, that he does not stand in the presence of a superior after all? Nothing of the kind. He rather says, "John, you are correct. It would be more fitting for me to baptize you, but, in the circumstances, there are reasons which make the other course right." These words prove that Jesus, even before the baptism, felt himself the superior of John, whom he afterwards called "more than a prophet" and, indeed, "the greatest born of women." Could such a superior be any other than the Messiah? A second consideration makes this answer certain. It is unpsychological to suppose that the vision at the baptism gave Jesus an entirely new idea. Things do not happen that way in life. God prepares men for his revelations, and must necessarily have done so in this case, where the revelation was the most astounding ever made to any of the sons of men. Had it come as unexpectedly as a bolt from the blue, it would probably first have

stunned and dazed Jesus, and then have unbalanced his mind. When we come to think it over carefully, we must believe that Jesus had *long* had the idea and that the voice from heaven gave him only his *final certainty*. And this is confirmed by those words reported as from his lips at twelve years of age, "I must be about my Father's business," [1] words which certainly do not imply Messiahship, but do suggest that even at that age Jesus felt that he was divinely called to devote his life to some distinctly religious task.

Some indeed would go further than this and say that he knew himself as Messiah even from the cradle. But in this they go not merely beyond scripture, but beyond all that we can understand. My Sunday School teacher, for instance, used to teach us that, as man, Jesus knew no more than an ordinary infant, but that, as God, he knew all things. This, however, was not Luke's view. He writes, "The child grew and waxed strong, becoming filled (margin) with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him" (Luke 2: 40); and again, "And Jesus advanced

[1] I prefer this translation of the Authorized Version.

in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and men" (Luke 2: 52); and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews thought that "though he was a Son, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (5: 8). Moreover such a double person, who thought and acted now as God and now as man, is very far removed from us, could not have been truly a man, nor have lived a truly human life. We cannot think of him as a real brother, involved in our difficulties, fighting the same sort of battle which we must fight, or really conquering in the moral conflict. This Jesus, now God and now man, is thus alien to us and we instinctively feel that he cannot truly sympathize with us in our temptations, struggles and sorrows.

My Sunday School teacher was only repeating a dictum of fourth century theologians, which cannot be made binding on free Protestant Christians, and which is entirely out of tune with modern feeling and conceptions. As a sincere attempt to explain the mystery of the personality of Jesus and guarantee his unique greatness and divinity, it is worthy of our respect, but we cannot help feeling that it is mechanical, unnatural,

impossible and without warrant either in Scripture or in experience. Our age demands a more vital theory, more in line with what we know of mental and moral growth, more congruous with the portrait of Jesus in the gospels. While perhaps we cannot define our idea with the sharpness vouchsafed those ancient theologians, we may say that we must think of Jesus as developing like any other child. Like all great personalities, he gradually became conscious of himself, of his capacities, of the work God had given him to do, and of the career and the destiny before him. But more than any other, he was led of the Spirit in it all.

But can we discover the source and trace the development of Jesus' idea that he was the Messiah during the years which preceded his baptism? I think we can. To be sure, the only passage to which we can appeal is the one already quoted, Luke 2: 49, "I must be about my Father's business." But this is too meagre a foundation on which to build, too uncertain in various ways to bear the superstructure we intend to erect. We are thrown back on wider considerations.

We choose to base the whole of our present

investigation and indeed the whole of this book on the moral perfection of Jesus. We do not prove this by reviewing all the words and deeds of Jesus recorded in the gospels, and coming to the conclusion that Jesus knew no sin. Such a method is illusory. These reports may not be unbiased and are certainly fragmentary, and the conclusion is therefore not indisputable. There is a broader and, it seems to me, an incontestable proof. It is this. The higher a man's moral and spiritual standard, the surer he is to see and confess his sinfulness and shortcomings. The greatest saints, like Paul, Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley, have ever felt their sin most acutely. Now all will acknowledge that Jesus was a man of exquisite moral feeling and deepest spiritual insight. He was and is the great searcher of human hearts. Yet he never seems to have been conscious of any sin or fault or shortcoming in himself. He never prayed for forgiveness, nor expressed the slightest regret for anything he ever did. Again, Jesus was the greatest teacher in the sphere of morals and religion. No one ever set the ethical standard so high, or preached more solemnly the seriousness of the moral struggle.

Yet he never by a single word expressed the slightest aspiration to be better than he was.

If it is objected that this proof also is insufficient, that, in this case too, omissions and imperfections in the records may render it all illusory, we answer with perfect confidence. This method of representing the goodness of Jesus as a goodness, unlike that of all other good men, without repentance and without aspiration, demands an originality and insight deeper than we can ascribe to the simple Christians who wrote these memorials. Moreover, according to this theory, they have succeeded in building upon this unique principle a character moving in a real world of men with its vicissitudes, perplexities and tragedies, uttering thousands of words on most diverse topics and in varied situations, and yet they have made him so natural, so real, so simple, so good and nevertheless so great, that he has influenced the world as none other. This feat, says Rousseau, no friend of Christianity, would be a greater miracle than the character itself. So also says John Stuart Mill. We agree with them. Jesus was the perfect man. No one has ever yet been able to conceive a char-

acter greater, wiser, or better than he, nor has anyone like him yet appeared in history. The greatest test of Jesus' character was this very idea of Messiahship; as Oscar Holtzmann says, "the greatest thought that ever entered a human mind and left it sane." But in spite of this marvelous assumption, he never strikes the reader of the gospels as an egotist, but is perfectly balanced, calm and straightforward, nay more, always giving the impression of gentleness, humility, love and unselfishness. "This impression of perfection which the Master made is entirely unique in the spiritual history of man. No one ever made it before, and no one ever tried to claim it."

Founding everything then upon the moral perfection of Jesus, we again ask, Can we discover the source and trace the development of his idea that he was the Messiah, during the years that preceded his baptism? We find that this question practically resolves itself into another, How would a morally perfect boy, the boy who became the man Jesus, develop? In other words, we must trace the character of Jesus to its source, and in so doing may legitimately

use all we know of Jesus, of his career, and of his thought, for the man is only the larger and maturer boy. The following paragraphs present therefore no merely imaginative picture based on a fanciful theory, but a sketch which is true to the best data we have.

First of all, brought up in a Jewish home, *the thought of God was perfectly natural to Jesus.* He drew it in with his mother's milk. He grew up with it. It was the very center of his thought. He was absolutely sure of God. Never a doubt about him ever flitted across his mind.

All the world seemed full of God to him. Heaven was God's throne, the earth was his footstool. God sent the sunshine and the rain, God fed the birds and would feed his children too, God made the grass grow and painted the lily. How much more would he clothe those who trusted him ever so imperfectly? God led men by his own hand. If perchance, to strengthen and broaden them, he brought them into temptation, he delivered them from the evil. Jesus was sure that God was always near and that he could depend upon him. His trust was as simple and as strong as that of a child in its mother.

God never seemed vague, unreal or strange to him. No slightest shade of alienation ever clouded God's face. No feeling of guilt ever made him afraid of God or gave him any desire to hide from him. He called God his Father, not because he mysteriously knew of some unique connection with him before the world was, but because he felt so much at home with God. I know that I am the son of a noble father, whom God yet graciously spares to me, not so much because of the facts recorded in the family Bible, as because I find myself so much one with him. I understand his peculiar physical movements. I know why he does just this or that, and exactly how he feels when he does these things. I divine his thought before he speaks. I anticipate his wishes. There is a deep understanding and interplay of feeling and life between us. His characteristic mental action is perfectly familiar to me. If someone asks him a question, I often can predict his reply before he utters it. Jesus knew his Father, God, even more intimately, found himself in wonderful harmony and unison with him. God's thought seemed to him the most natural thing in the world. He found

that he felt as God felt towards righteousness and evil, toward men and life. He discovered that his own deepest purpose was a reproduction of his Father's. So he *felt* that God was his Father. It was deeper than reason, alien to the realm of logic. It was instinct. His moral and spiritual likeness to God made him sure that he was God's own child.

So he lived in daily communion with his Father, and this communion was the sunshine of his soul, the very life of his inmost spirit. It was an unbroken and delightful union of love, an unspeakable joy welling up from the very depths of his nature.

He read the Old Testament like every other Jewish child, but he dwelt most of all on Deuteronomy, the Psalms and the prophets. These were his favorite books. In loving study of these scriptures, he often meditated on Isaiah's glowing prophecies of the glory, purity and blessing of Messianic times, but he felt that nothing there described went beyond what he experienced every day. God's presence, the light of his countenance, the satisfaction of soul, the deep peace, the holy joy, the sense of perfect security, the

beauty of righteousness, so sublimely described, all were his. He could imagine no future in which he or other men could enjoy more than he already possessed. There was only one conclusion, these prophecies had been fulfilled in him, heaven was in his heart, the kingdom of God was within him. In Nazareth, he daily sat down to all of the good things of the Messianic feast and rejoiced as he looked into his Father's face. Others might think the Messianic time to be still future, but in his own soul, he knew that it was *now*.

All this had a charming naturalness about it. As Jesus developed, his secret conviction grew in strength and definiteness. His was a happy, healthy boyhood. It is a great mistake to suppose that sin is an essential part of human nature. It is not only not necessary to it, but is an ugly twist given to what would otherwise be good and beautiful. It is a greater mistake to look upon religion in a child as something unnatural and morbid. This sinless boy who grew up with the thought of God as his Father, whose moral perfection deepened and widened with his experience of life, was the only perfectly normal

boy of whom history tells us, and if we but knew more of the years of his childhood and youth, would be the ideal for boys of all lands and all ages.

With this treasure in his heart, Jesus looked out of happy eyes, upon the world of men about him. He observed the motives and conduct of his brothers and sisters, of the men and women of Nazareth, and perhaps from the hill beyond the city gazed on the Roman legions as they marched, and the traffic which streamed to and fro along the road between Ptolemais on the one hand and Capernaum and Damascus on the other. All lived the ordinary life of men before him. They had no idea that this quiet, good boy was to make the name of his obscure town known on all the continents and through all the centuries. So they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded, they married and were given in marriage. But Jesus' sensitive soul soon discovered, possibly at first with some surprise, that these people had no such blessed experience of the Father's presence and love as he possessed.

God seemed far off from them and they from

God, they did not live in his presence, nor feel him in their hearts. It was theirs to keep his law, to be sure, but he himself, most of them conceived, lived far away in heaven, only remotely interested in their daily cares. Some, who had been caught in the snare of Gentile thought, even doubted whether there were a God.

They looked out upon the world, but they did not see God in it all. The sun rose in the splendor of crimson and gold over the eastern hills, flooding the world with light, and set in the western sea, painting the sky with glory, but most of them never noticed it, and few saw the God of beauty and of love in it. They painfully or carelessly toiled along the common road from the cradle to the grave, but few saw the Father's hand leading them through the sunshine and the shadow.

Many were estranged from God by a sense of sin and guilt. He grew very dim and misty to their thought and they felt a wall of separation between him and them. When conscience awoke, they feared him as a criminal fears the judge. Some of them indeed did not like to think of him, for the thought brought them no joy or

peace. Possibly Jesus may have spoken to many of them of the blessedness of his experience, but found their ears deaf and their heart gross.

Jesus saw that all their life and happiness was spoiled by sin and selfishness and inner falsity, by envy, jealousy, covetousness, lust, contempt, pride and hatred, by anxiety, distrust and fear, by aimlessness, loneliness, weariness and despair, by the burden of guilt and the consciousness of moral failure; and with poverty, disaster, disease and death ever standing just behind the door, their lot was sad indeed.

Then his Savior-heart was stirred. He was filled with compassion for them, for they were scattered and distressed as sheep that had no shepherd. His limitless love went out to them. He knew that all their sin and misery would vanish, if they could only live like him in the sunshine of the Father's face, and he longed to bring them into the blessing which irradiated his life with purity and peace and joy.[1]

[1] He felt that he had what they had not. "He never put himself on the same level of sonship with men. He felt himself above men here. They needed repentance, he none. He could not have called himself Messiah, if he had not felt the difference first."
Von Soden.

And this was his call, a call from above. Here was his work, a work which lay immediately at his hand. It was perfectly simple, perfectly plain. All he had to do was to bring men into the same communion with God which he possessed. His whole business was to give, to give his inner self to those about him. And he felt in himself the strength to do it. He understood now that he had been born for no other purpose, that God had given him all needed resources to accomplish this blessed mission. He trusted in God to lead him, to show him the way, to give him the opportunities. The voice at the baptism only brought him to a final certainty. With every step the conviction deepened that his Father had sent him to do this very thing. And when the road grew rough and steep, and the shadow of a cross loomed in the distance, his love never drew back, but he went right on through suspicion, calumny, danger, treachery, insult, pain and death itself to do his work of love.

Most appropriately Luke represents him as preaching his first sermon from the text, long since spoken of the Servant of Jehovah,

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor:
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

And the middle of the ministry repeats the message:

"Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest to your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." He bids men come to him and learn what his heart can teach them. That heart's experience is salvation and rest.

Having this work to do, having received this divine call, having been endued with all the power of the Spirit, he most naturally thought of himself as Messiah. There was no other word in his world to express him. So we see that his Messiahship was no arbitrary title, ambitiously grasped at in self-will by one who could scarcely

stagger under its load. We see too how unsatisfactory and superficial is the view that it was something unexpectedly imposed upon him from without at his baptism. Rather his inner experience of communion with God, his sonship, was the source of his Messiahship. What he was was the root of what he became. He came to think that he was the Messiah, because he found that he had a Messiah's work to do, and that he had within himself the resources to do it. The strong man leaped up with joy to perform the mighty task, confident in his own powers, and relying implicitly on God.

All was natural. It was the unfolding of the greatest of personalities. He went forth to share with men his joy, his freedom, his light, his energy; to give men his life—a life with God, a life of love and righteousness. This is the inmost secret of his mission. To this delightful spiritual experience of his boyhood and youth we trace everything back as to its spring. Nay more, the source of the church, of Christianity and of Christian civilization is found at last to be the heart of Jesus.

And as a matter of fact, history has proved

that he was the Messiah in the sense in which he used that term. He was and is God's special Representative upon earth. Men can name no greater. No one else has ever so impressed upon the world the sense of the presence of God. He seems the embodiment of the divine purity and the divine love. He brings in himself God's message of peace and hope to men. In him we see the Father, learn to know his will, and feel the beating of his heart. Jesus translates all our religious abstractions into concrete realities, all our theologies into life, all our vague spiritual dreams and hopes into action and endeavor.

He was and is the Bringer of Salvation. All who have come to him, who have accepted the simple though radical conditions which he lays down, and who have surrendered their lives to his guidance have been saved. And by this I mean that, either gradually or suddenly, according to temperament and the circumstances of the case, they have experienced such a sense of freedom from old burdens and limitations, such a new feeling of purity and peace, such an access of moral and spiritual power, such a realization of love for all men and especially for God, such

a new and worthy purpose in life, such a unity of heart and mind and will, such freshness, joy and hope as all together can be counted nothing less than a new life. And they come to recognize that this is, after all, only sharing the wonderful energy and purity of the inner life of Jesus. And just in proportion as nations and ages and society in general have entered into the blessings which Jesus offers in himself, have they felt the new stir, the new impulse and the new hope, and entered upon higher moral and spiritual stages of development.

He was and is the Founder of the Kingdom of God on earth. That kingdom is being set up today on every continent and among the people of every race and language on the whole globe. His name is praised from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. All spheres of life and activity are being subdued to his will. The multitude which hails him the Lord of their lives continually increases, and with fervent faith believes the day will come when he shall reign as the spiritual leader and undisputed moral king of men. No one can reasonably doubt that the present movement descends through the centuries from the Jesus of Galilee and Jerusalem.

He is and will be the Judge of Men. If he is, as we have tried to prove, the one morally and spiritually perfect man, the new type of a higher race, excelling all others in beauty and strength and the glory of a divine holiness and love, then surely every character must finally be tested by the attitude assumed toward him, and he becomes the touchstone of destiny.

So then he is Messiah, not only because we can show from many Scripture passages that he so thought himself, but because he had the experience of God and the spiritual power to do a Messiah's work, and lastly because, as a matter of fact, he was and is God's special Representative on earth, the Bringer of Salvation, the Founder of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Judge of Men. History has proved him to be Messiah, in the sense in which he used the word.

CHAPTER IV

HOW JESUS HANDLED MESSIANISM

Part I

Two great elements in the life of Palestine determined the outer form of the career of Jesus, and their complications constituted that tangled web of circumstance through which he had to cut his way. The first was Pharisaic legalism, the less important of the two, whose consideration we consequently postpone to another chapter. The other and more important, to one who believed himself the Messiah, was the Messianic Hope of Israel.

At the risk of repetition, we again sketch the situation. The common people, at least after John the Baptist began to preach, eagerly expected a Messiah, who would be a son of David, born as a man of men, an earthly king, who would break the power of the Romans, deliver the Jews from their oppression, hold a judgment day, found a world empire with Jerusalem as

the capital and the Jews as the ruling people, and thenceforth reign in peace and righteousness. This Messiah would be endowed with supernatural powers, and would have all the resources of God for his great and holy enterprise. The ethical element was of the essence of this hope, more or less strong in the minds of various groups.

The Zealots were the men who took this expectation of a political Messiah in earnest, and felt that if they only initiated the rebellion against Rome, God would send the Messiah to their aid. They were the party of action and aggression. It is important for us to remember that Galilee was the birthplace and the hotbed of Zealotism. It is the free-born, unspoiled Galileans, who rise in rebellion again and again, against whom Vespasian with sixty thousand men must wage a relentless campaign of a year's duration, before he can besiege the capital. It is these Galilean Zealots, who undertake the defense of Jerusalem, who die in the last ditch at Masada, and who grace Titus' triumph in Rome. The Jerusalem and Judea of Jesus' time, rich, ecclesiastical, formal, did not favor such violent

and fanatical ideas. They felt on the whole that it was best to wait God's good time, which they thought would come only on condition of a perfect keeping of the law, and therefore was indefinitely distant. Then in some inexplicable way God would send his Messiah, a being more or less vaguely supernatural, who would carry out the same political program which the common people expected.

A few among the Pharisees carried the hope of a supernatural Messiah to its extreme. They looked for a preëxistent Son of Man, who would come from heaven to judge the world and inaugurate a new age of supernatural glory. This was *the apocalyptic view*, as opposed to *the political view* held with variations by the common people, the Zealots and the more conservative Pharisees. With these two views, apocalyptic and political, Jesus had to reckon.

This chapter will show how Jesus handled these ideas and sentiments, and will especially attempt to trace the movement of his own mind and to analyze the great crises of his Messianic career. It will therefore be a skeleton sketch of his ministry from his own point of view, dealing

with the more important questions connected with his life.

Jesus entered this world of conflicting Messianic views *with a different and perfectly definite Messianic conception of his own*, utterly independent of the popular ideas in its origin, for it had its source in his own experience of God and of spiritual blessedness. The clue that will lead us through the tangled maze before us is simply this, that Jesus held firmly to his own conception of his mission to the end. To be sure, he must relate it to the popular ideas, must express it in the popular language, and must perhaps modify it and add to it as vicissitudes arose. But he never changed it in any essential particular. Whatever he appropriated from the popular beliefs only served to express his own view to the people, or helped him to hold it strongly in the swirling eddies of the conflict. And this is the touch of reality. The gospels show us the idealistic man of Nazareth with his matchless inner experience leaving his quiet life, and, the moment he steps upon the public stage, caught in the cross currents of interests, opinions and prejudices, and soon in desperate struggle with narrow

bigotry, sordid covetousness, patriotic ambitions and treacherous superficiality. Here is the ideal man in the real world.

The origin and content of Jesus' own view of his mission and Messiahship were sketched in the last chapter. Suffice it to say here that, immediately after his baptism, Jesus was sure of two things; that he enjoyed a unique relationship and communion with God, and that he was called of God to bring this spiritual blessing to men, especially to the Jewish nation. This was salvation, and he was, therefore, Savior. To this end, he felt himself endued with all the necessary spiritual power. These are the fundamental facts about Jesus, at this time, and it is necessary for us to conceive them clearly in all their simplicity. Our whole aim must be to see Jesus with new eyes, to put aside for the time at least all preconceptions and prejudices, to forget the everlasting debate about New Testament descriptions of him and the later theological controversies about his person, and to observe this Galilean in his actual career as objectively as did the earliest disciples and yet with minds even more open than theirs. When the clouds of dust raised

by centuries of conflict and criticism finally lift, we should see that the naked fact is that a *new type of man, fresh, strong and unique, appeared in our race* in the first century. With this simple and yet pregnant statement, we begin independently to make our own sketch of the history and significance of Jesus.

We shall not understand the man or the history, however, unless we recognize as fundamental in him a crystalline purity of heart, an absolute honesty and straightforwardness, which precluded the slightest attempt to appear what he was not, and prevented him from swerving for a moment a hair's breadth from the straight line of right to court popularity, avoid pain, or fall in with the ideas of the crowd. In other words, he was morally sound to the core. His hope, his perfect childlike trust was not in man, but in God, his Father, on whom he relied for guidance and loving care. Yet no man ever walked more warily than he. In him boldness, faith and wisdom were perfectly combined.

Immediately after his baptism, Jesus was certain that he was the Messiah or Savior in the sense already stated. The very simplicity of it

all was almost baffling, however. How was he to go to work? What were to be the first steps of this Nazarene carpenter, who wanted to save the world, and yet was so different from what a Messiah was expected to be? On what fundamental principles was he to act? The story of the Temptation lets us into his inner thought on these questions. Here we see the kind of things he decided not to do and the positive laws of conduct which emerge from the decisions. The first temptation tells us that he would not use the peculiar power of which he was conscious to help himself out of any difficulty or danger, even to save his life. "He saved others, himself he could not save." Without any reserve, he threw himself into the service of men, by this principle burning all his bridges behind him. He trusted only in God's provision for his wants and God's aid in distress. Beyond that he would not and could not go. He resolved to fight the fight with advantages no greater than are vouchsafed the humblest and weakest of men. In the second contest he met and conquered the lure to fanaticism, the tempting of God in self-will and spiritual pride. This is one of the commonest, sub-

tlest and most destructive enticements and it appeals most powerfully to men of faith. It was the ruin of all the Jewish Messianic pretenders of that age. But Jesus decided that his ministry should be sane. In the third struggle, he put away the kingly crown. He would not be the popular political warrior Messiah, conquering all the kingdoms of the world, but would accomplish his spiritual ends by spiritual means. Thus he definitely repudiated all ideas of political Messiahship and broke with the expectations of the vast majority of the people. And this was final. On this point, he never wavered nor compromised.

Having made these decisions, he went forth calm and yet in deadly earnest to do his work in his own way. The keenness of moral insight, the practical largeness of view, and the strength of character evinced in what is called the Temptation must not escape us. Nor should we forget that the life principles here disclosed are given us, in all probability, in the words of Jesus himself, who could have been the only reporter, and that he made the report many months after the occurrence. These considerations strengthen our

belief that Jesus not only made these decisions at the beginning, but consciously recognized them as determining the character of his ministry throughout.

Jesus had principles then, but no elaborate plan of action. He was mostly an opportunist, allowing himself to be led by events, for in them he saw his Father's hand. Yet, in great crises, after long and earnest prayer, he boldly took the initiative. His last journey to Jerusalem is a striking illustration. From the first also he decided that preaching and teaching would be his method (cf. Mark 1: 38, the Sower, the Tares and his actual career) and to that he clung to the very end. With his conception of his mission as that of bringing men into the blessings of his own experience of God, this was the only simple, honest thing to do. Moreover, he conceived that he ought to evangelize the whole Jewish nation and do a work in every province. So he was a teacher Messiah, a prophet Messiah in outward form at least, and, most naturally, began his work by assisting John the Baptist.

But how could Jesus think and call himself the Messiah, when that name meant to the

people something entirely different from what he intended to be? Was this pretending to be something which he was not? Must it not necessarily lead to tragic misunderstandings? We answer, To be sure, the *literal* points of *exact* agreement between the popular idea of the Messiah and Jesus were reduced to one, viz.:—that the Messiah would work miracles. Jesus was neither warrior king nor, during his lifetime at least, apocalyptic judge. Yet he was God's special representative on earth; he came to bring salvation and found the kingdom of God and, if so, there was no other Jewish word to describe him except Messiah. Doubtless salvation and the kingdom of God had, in his thought, a higher and more spiritual meaning than they had in the thought of his contemporaries. Indeed he himself belonged to a higher and more spiritual sphere than they had yet conceived, and therefore was very different from the divine representative whom they had expected. But there was no higher popular title to describe him than Messiah, and none so nearly fitted to set forth his appointed work. The only thing which he could do was to fill the word, Messiah, with the

higher and simpler meaning, and this task Jesus undertook and accomplished with a heavenly wisdom. This attempt was justifiable and the result in a sense successful largely because popular ideas, on all these subjects, were loose and confused; Jesus' teaching and person were the concrete realities which brought the open-minded to definiteness and decision. In short, Jesus and his mission found no human words or conceptions high enough or simple enough to express them, and he necessarily took the highest words and conceptions available and filled them with a new and higher content. In one sense, he was not the Messiah (of popular thought), but much more than the Messiah.

If Jesus had not assumed Messiahship, men would have asked, What relation does your work bear to the Old Testament representations of the Messiah? Jesus could not have said, There will be no Messiah. He did say, I am the Messiah, the true Messiah is such as I.

What has been said on this point does not imply that Jesus' idea that he was the Messiah involved the logical process just sketched. Rather as we showed in the last chapter, the idea sprang

up in him spontaneously and necessarily. He could call himself nothing else, and never thought of calling himself anything else. I have simply explained why, and have justified Jesus' spontaneous thought.

Jesus also encountered the political difficulty. A political Messiah, a warrior Messiah, a king of the Jews, such as the people and especially the Zealots expected, would be a traitor to the Romans, would receive short shrift at their hands if unsuccessful, and, if successful, must lead an insurrection against them. All these ideas were abhorrent to Jesus, yet how could he call himself Messiah and not awaken these hopes and suggest these popular connotations? This was a vital and finally tragic problem for Jesus, and one to which he was constantly alive. In an atmosphere palpitating with Zealotism, he naturally never went about claiming to be the Messiah, as many seem to think, but always exercised a holy discretion and reserve on this point.

We find that in consequence of the situation which we have described, Jesus does not begin by announcing his Messiahship, but by pro-

claiming and explaining the kingdom of God. First, he preaches the spiritual kingdom, and then at last discloses himself as the spiritual king, for he thinks the cause of the righteousness of the kingdom is after all summed up in him (Matthew 5: 11). The kingdom was a common idea and meant the political Messianic kingdom. Jesus also meant by it the Messianic reign and realm; but, to emphasize its spiritual origin and character, called it the kingdom of God. This exact phrase is found only rarely, if at all, in the Old Testament and the prechristian Jewish literature, but the idea itself is very common.

Jesus' thought about the kingdom and sovereignty of God was just as much his own, just as independent of popular conceptions in its origin, just as clearly founded on his personal experience as his thought of Messiahship and is indeed the counterpart of it. It may be defined as follows: The Father was sovereign in his own heart and life. He had come to induce all men to accept this blessed sovereignty and to enjoy all the satisfactions and privileges of the Father's love. With him the Messiah, the Messianic reign had come. The kingdom was within

him. It was to be realized and set up on the earth *now*. Its full realization could, however, come only in the future when it should become universal, but men could now prepare themselves for the enjoyment of that future by change of mind and heart toward sin and toward God and righteousness. So the kingdom was both present and future. Yet the future was the more glorious and characteristic. The ethical conditions of sharing the Messianic blessing stripped it of the last shred of nationalism, took it out of politics and guaranteed its universal and spiritual nature. Yet, while beginning as an individual experience, it involved new social relations and indeed a new and heavenly society on this earth, a society in which the will of God would be done as perfectly, unanimously and joyously as in heaven itself. Jesus' work was not merely proclaiming and explaining this kingdom, but also inducing men to receive it and enter into it, that is, founding the new society.

But entirely apart from the political situation and the circle of narrow Jewish ideas in which Jesus found himself (i. e., apart from the political and pedagogical considerations), there was an-

other reason why Jesus preached the kingdom first, and always more emphatically than the king. This reason is found in the very nature of his mission, is therefore of primary significance and would have been operative, if the other motives had not existed. The kingdom is actually *first in importance in his thought* because the kingdom stood for *the experience of blessing*, present and future, into which he conceived himself divinely sent to bring men. See his equation of the kingdom and this experience of blessing in the Beatitudes, in the representation of the Messianic Feast, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, and in the formula, "the good news of the kingdom." To have put himself to the front would have confused men on this point, would have made them think that some belief about him (i. e., that he was the Messiah, with appropriate political action based on that belief) was more important than entrance into the new life of righteousness and faith. It would have been analogous to the mistake of his church in those ages when it has put the emphasis on an intellectual assent to the deity of Christ rather than on the new life he bade men lead. Still this experience of blessing

was to be had only in union with him, it was the experience of his own heart which he wished to share with others. He was after all essential to it and to its vigorous and sustained development. In the end he could not be hid, the king as well as the kingdom must appear.

Did he at first expect an immediate success in his enterprise? The evidence is inconclusive and the answer doubtful. Much is involved in the decision, yet it must be made. Else we can never gain clearness on the fundamental aspects of Jesus' career and must always walk in the mists. After long and painful wavering, I have finally come to believe that Jesus did at first expect immediate success, and on these grounds:—a. Luke 13: 6–9, the parable of the Barren Fig-tree, gets its whole point from the fact that the issue of the salvation of the Jewish people through Jesus' work is not yet certain, and with this the lament over Jerusalem, "How often would I have gathered thee" (Matthew 23: 37), is to be compared. b. The whole spirit of the early ministry seems to exhibit the expectation of a sweeping victory. Jesus seems at first even to have had hopes of at least the Galilean Pharisees (Luke 15:

25–32). c. The historical and psychological difficulties of the opposite view are almost insuperable. d. This goes well with our statement in Chapter III about the gradual development of Jesus' Messianic consciousness.

So we believe that he began his work with the greatest enthusiasm, though with some misgivings caused by the Temptation, and that he only slowly learned the bitter truth. Only toward the middle of his Galilean activity, was he finally convinced that his earthly ministry was doomed to comparative failure so far as immediate results were concerned and that he could accomplish his mission only through his death. Some may ask what would have happened if Jesus had had the success, which he at first anticipated. The inquiry opens up vast reaches of possibilities, through which we cannot find our way. If the question ever came into Jesus' mind, he doubtless left all such future contingencies to his Father's love and wisdom.

Jesus' popularity in Galilee was immediate and immense. Its basis was primarily the power and attractiveness of his personality, his moral and spiritual enthusiasm, the simplicity and sym-

pathy of his heart, the fresh note of freedom, courage and hope. This was reinforced by the authority, plainness and common sense of his preaching, his miracles, especially those of healing and casting out demons, and his alluring promises of Messianic blessings. Still, this popularity was hollow and Jesus soon saw its hollowness. The crowd was moved mostly by curiosity, wonder and a hope of external advantages from what they vaguely felt to be a Messianic movement. Only a comparatively few understood his message of a spiritual salvation in a spiritual kingdom, and soon they too were involved in misunderstanding and externalism. So difficult is it to get purely spiritual conceptions into men's minds. The parables of the Sower and the Tares evidence Jesus' recognition of the superficiality of this seeming success.

During this period, as we have seen, he was engaged in explaining the nature of the kingdom, but did not openly or plainly declare his Messiahship. Rather he carefully concealed it.[1] Yet

[1] The seeming exceptions to this statement are to be explained from the peculiar geographical or personal circumstances involved in the particular case or possibly by the application of critical principles.

the authority with which he spoke and acted, his mighty miracles, the confessions of the demons, his forgiveness of sins, his superiority to John the Baptist who had announced the Coming One, his constant assertion that he was God's representative and an altogether extraordinary person, his authoritative proclamation of an imminent, indeed a present Messianic kingdom, all filled the people with expectation and led them to surmise that this could be no other than the Messiah, different as he was from what they had anticipated the Messiah would be.

The Galilean ministry consequently ended with an explosion of Zealotism, for which the train had long been laying. It is commonly called the Crisis at Capernaum. Its immediate causes were three events which occurred in closest connection: the Mission of the Twelve, who had not freed themselves from the idea of a political Messiah and who may have been more or less indiscreet in their preaching; the news of the murder of John the Baptist, which must have profoundly stirred the people against Herod Antipas and the Roman overlordship; and the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The result was that five thousand en-

thusiastic men, the nucleus for an effective army, attempted to seize Jesus and make him a king (a political Messiah). It was an hour of gravest peril for Jesus and the world, but he met the crisis with admirable decision. In the synagogue at Capernaum the next day, he explained to the people that he had no material blessings for them. He could give them only himself, the Bread of Life. Moreover, he intimated that he was going to die. The crowds deserted him; it looked as if even the Twelve might waver. His Galilean popularity was at an end. At the same time he finally broke with the Pharisees on the subject of clean and unclean meats, but that belongs to another chapter.

Jesus now leaves Palestine, for some weeks at least, and wanders with his disciples in Gentile territory. They are alone, no multitudes follow him. He has been rejected both by the people and by the scribes. Not the slightest sign or prospect of political Messiahship remains. In these circumstances he asks his disciples for their opinion of him. Peter, their spokesman, declares him the Messiah in spite of it all. He founds this judgment not on any external mark of Messiah-

ship, but only on what Jesus was in himself and the spiritual blessing he had brought to his followers. It was at last a confession of a spiritual Messiah, however confused with older ideas it might be. It was an epoch in Jesus' ministry and in the history of the kingdom. And Jesus clinched it with the definite announcement of his final rejection, sufferings and death. This in principle absolutely put an end to all the old Messianic conceptions and hopes. A dying Messiah was no Messiah (in the old sense) at all. But Jesus added that all his followers must be ready for the cross as well as he. This was a bitter truth, fitted to cut the root of all externalism, pride and self-seeking, and to leave them nothing outside the spiritual sphere.

There arises the difficult question how far Jesus had made known his Messiahship *to the disciples* before Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi. The Fourth Gospel represents John the Baptist as pointing him out as Messiah, but this could have been only to a private circle of those who afterwards became apostles. This private circle, as well as John the Baptist, understood Messiahship, however, in the popular sense,

more or less spiritualized, and were doubtless strictly charged not to speak of it in public (cf. Jesus' charge to the demonized, the leper, etc.). In the meantime we know that Jesus was adopting the same method of instruction in private as in public, i. e., he was teaching a spiritual view of the kingdom rather than proclaiming himself the Messiah, but all the while his manner of life and teaching was nevertheless impressing his unique personality and mission. The great advance at Caesarea Philippi was an advance in the spiritual conception of the Messiahship, the founding of all Messianic claim on the spiritual nature and power of Jesus. Once discovered in the disciples by Jesus, this was reinforced and deepened by the teaching of the cross. Only this view of an original belief of the disciples in Jesus' Messiahship, together with a growth in the disciples' conception of it, can adequately explain the phenomena before the confession of Peter, especially their willingness to follow him, their joy in his presence, their clinging to him when all deserted him. If the people more than suspected that he was the Messiah, surely the disciples must have been certain of it.

Had Jesus from the first expected rejection and a violent death? In accord with the position already taken we must say that he had not. He had at first anticipated that Israel, as a whole, would accept him as its spiritual Messiah and with him all the blessings which he brought.[1] Not without misgivings, however, for in the Temptation Jesus seems to have recognized and weighed the might and unalterable opposition of the forces which were bound to oppose him. The bitterness of his conflict with the scribes, and especially, his growing distrust of the enthusiasm of the multitudes must have changed these misgivings into conviction. There could be only one end. He could not change nor abandon his mission, he must go on with his work, and the result, he clearly saw, must be his violent death. If so, he thought that his death must be the Father's will; but it could not mean failure; death must be only a means of victory, the climax of his earthly mission. This is the new experience,

[1] Yet both John the Baptist and Jesus always despaired of the ruling Sadducaic-Pharisaic clique at Jerusalem and of legalistic Judaism. Their only hope was that the people as a whole would leave Judaism and come over to the new spiritual kingdom, in which Jesus would spiritually rule.

the new revelation which came to Jesus in the middle of his ministry. He must save the world by dying for it. He must bring it to know God and his richest blessings by the sacrifice of himself. Thus he would redeem from the power of sin all who received him and followed him as the dying Savior, and his death would lay the foundation of a new covenant, a new society, a new Israel.

Part II

And here we meet the most difficult problem of all. Jesus now saw that the future and more glorious kingdom lay beyond his death. Yet he was perfectly certain that he had been called to found that kingdom by the impartation of his own inner experience of communion with God. He was sure that the kingdom would come and in his mind it was axiomatic, nay almost a matter of definition, that the kingdom could not come without him. Indeed a Messianic reign without a Messiah was to him unthinkable. Now Jesus in common with all Pharisaic Jews believed in the life beyond death, and he had no doubt that from the cross he would go to the Father; indeed many

Jews believed that the Messiah was hidden with God. With these thoughts in the background, we can easily see how Jesus, after accepting the tragic outcome of his earthly life, became convinced that he would survive death in the spiritual world, would reign at the Father's right hand, would personally inaugurate the more glorious kingdom on earth and rule in it as king. This more glorious kingdom would only be his own blessed experience of God now become universal and effective in human hearts and human society. All this was only another evidence of his supreme confidence in his God-given mission and its ultimate triumph. Indeed this thought of Jesus rests on two universal principles:—every divine impulse in humanity is sure of final victory; and every great moral and spiritual movement under the best conditions centers about a personality, who is its fountain of life and power. As a matter of fact, Jesus has been the source of spiritual energy to his followers for twenty centuries, is today the rallying point of their hope, and the ground of their unyielding faith in final triumph.

Jesus from the beginning had never for a moment compromised with the political, nationalistic

Messianism of his day, but did he, on the other hand, in the idea of his Coming, accept in part at least the apocalyptic idea of the Messiah? The answer must be a modified "yes," if we hold to our Gospel data (cf. p. 29f.). There is no evidence that Jesus ever read any of the current apocalypses of his day, but these apocalyptic ideas were common among the people, springing, as they did, out of the Book of Daniel, which was a part of their Bible. As one of the common people, with the Old Testament in his hand, Jesus was perfectly familiar with apocalyptic ideas.

Jesus' favorite self-designation was Son of Man. Where did he get it? From Daniel 7: 13, 14.[1] To him it meant Messiah, especially in the rôle of Founder of the Kingdom of God. He loved the passage for three reasons at least, first because it represented the Messiah and his kingdom *as a man* over against the dreadful beasts, symbolizing

[1] Readers are urged to study the whole of Daniel 7. The old idea, still so common, that Jesus referred to his divine nature by the phrase Son of God, and to his human nature by the phrase, Son of Man, is no longer tenable. Both phrases meant Messiah, and were related to his Messianic character and mission. Certainly Jesus during his earthly life had no need to emphasize his humanity which was patent to everybody.

world-empires. Unlike them he had no terrifying appearance or frightful weapons. It was their part to destroy and tear to pieces, but it was his, humanly, intelligently and peacefully, to construct a new society by spiritual means. The passage also appealed to him because it echoed his certainty that this work and kingdom were given to him by God and, lastly, because it declared that his reign should be world-wide and eternal. In the conflicts, disappointments and crises of his life, this passage was to him a guiding star. He was that Son of Man. All the plots of his enemies against One with such a destiny were petty and temporary.

Did Jesus by the use of the phrase, Son of Man, disclose his Messiahship to the people? This is a very difficult question, for, since Jesus often used the phrase publicly, it involves our whole conception of a period of reserve with reference to the Messiahship. The truth seems to be that by the common people among whom Jesus moved "Son of Man" would not be understood to mean Messiah, but would be to them a striking enigmatic phrase, provoking curiosity and inquiry as to what Jesus meant by it. Pos-

sibly in inner Scribal circles, it was more than a hint that he believed himself to be Messiah, and yet a hint of such a kind that they could scarcely seize upon it to his harm (cf. Son of Man, in Psalm 8, Ezekiel, Book of Enoch, and John 12: 34).

The phrase, Son of Man, is derived from an apocalyptic passage, but may have meant to Jesus nothing more at first than what has already been stated (p. 85f.). After he became convinced that the future Messianic kingdom lay beyond his death however, the apocalyptic phraseology became a part of Jesus' speech and perhaps influenced his thought. As our records stand, Jesus plainly said that after his death he was coming on the clouds of heaven to judge the world and inaugurate the more glorious stage of the kingdom, and that this would occur before the end of the contemporary generation. This cannot be explained away by a candid exegesis. And yet, as a matter of fact, he did not so come in the life-time of that generation. The date and the apocalyptic manner of the Coming constitute two grave difficulties for modern men. There seem to be only two positions which may be taken. Either Jesus spoke as the records

stand and was in error; this would change traditional ideas about Jesus, possibly seriously. Or, to choose the other horn of the dilemma, the records are not trustworthy in this matter; the disciples, full of the political and apocalyptic Messianism, misunderstood Jesus. It is therefore a question between a mistaken Jesus and untrustworthy records, or records untrustworthy at this point at least (cf. Mark 13: 30 and parallels, Mark 9: 1 and parallels, Matthew 10: 23).

In such a case, we must proceed from the known to the unknown. The gospels give us the Jesus, whom we have already presented, a Jesus great and commanding, profoundly spiritual in his views and teachings, simple, sane, independent, certain of himself, his mission and his Father. Nothing which impugns this character, so naïvely and simply drawn and yet so wonderfully complex and unique, can be true. As to the date, "in that generation," it may be said that such an error is incidental and external, merely in the intellectual sphere, and that it is not inconsistent with the honesty or spiritual greatness of Jesus. He was perfectly certain that he was Messiah. The Messiah was to appear at the end of the

age. He had appeared. The end was near. It was the error of a hero of faith, filled with the thought of the time. Or, if this does not satisfy us, it is open to us to say that Jesus predicted the coming of the Spirit, the destruction of Jerusalem, the victory of his church and his own personal Coming, the first two at least in that generation; and that the disciples, obsessed with apocalyptic notions, unconsciously transferred this date to his personal Coming, and gradually emphasized his Coming out of all due proportion.

As to the apocalyptic form, "in the clouds of heaven," it may be said that the catastrophic feature of it is not inconsistent with modern theories of evolution in biology or history. Geology now knows catastrophic periods. The bursting of spring, the emergence of the butterfly, the birth of the child, are all catastrophic and each brings in a new age. A few years or months or even days have often changed the whole course of history, and similarly have produced new eras. Nor is such an idea, when rightly conceived, inconsistent with Jesus' teaching of the gradual growth of the kingdom in other passages.

Gradual growth often ends in a catastrophic consummation. Why not in the case of the kingdom?

Nor are we to think that Jesus changed his fundamental spiritual attitude and conceptions when he adopted the apocalyptic form. He who employed the Jewish ideas of kingdom and Messiah to express himself to his followers, yet remoulded them for his own uses, filled them with a new content, and partially transferred them to the present, did not fall a foolish victim to apocalyptic mania; but, when the new idea of final spiritual victory in spite of death demanded assertion, he did as he had done before, he took the apt apocalyptic form, familiar to all Jews, and through that taught them figuratively things which he could not have expounded literally and definitely.[1] Indeed the latter course would have been inadequate and ineffective, and therefore stupid in the circumstances. And when we note Jesus' free use of parable and metaphor, the figurative nature of the Daniel passage itself

[1] In fact, there may have been sayings of Jesus, capable of explaining much along this line, which, not being understood by the disciples, disappeared before they found a place in the tradition.

from which "the clouds of heaven" are derived,[1] when we study how Jesus himself reported his baptism and temptation, and his vision of the fall of Satan in Luke 10: 18, it is open to those of us, who wish to do so, to explain the form of the Coming "on the clouds of heaven" as figurative, the form, but not the substance: the figure is the figure of something.

If we can no longer be satisfied with the literal "Coming in clouds," we may therefore believe that Jesus taught that towards the end of that generation or, possibly, at some indefinite future time, there would occur a spiritual event in human history, so wonderful that all would sense it beyond mistake, so plain that all would recognize its significance, so mighty as to inaugurate a new age and judge and destroy all hostile forces, so personal as to constitute for his people and all others a coming of Christ Jesus himself, his final triumph, the climax and consummation of his Messianic work. This event must be conceived as still future, for its chief characteristic is that it will usher in an age when God's will shall be

[1] Note that, throughout the whole Bible, the "cloud" is the constant symbol of the manifested presence of God.

done on earth as it is done in heaven. Come quickly, even so, come, Lord Jesus.

From the time of Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus' principal thought was to complete his Messianic work by his death at Jerusalem (cf. p. 82f.). On the way to the capital, he evangelized Perea. This Perean ministry followed the lines of the earlier ministry in Galilee, but was briefer, more decisive and solemn. He now knew that nothing which occurred in Perea could change the final result.

At the end of the Perean ministry, he entered Jerusalem with a Passover throng of Pereans and Galileans. Contrary to his usual custom, Jesus had carefully planned this Triumphal Entry. It was a public announcement of his Messiahship, and a demand that he be received as Messiah by the nation and its official leaders. He could not allow any misunderstanding on that point at the end. If he is to die, he will die as a rejected Messiah.

Some have thought that Jesus here compromised with the idea of political Messiahship, or at least gave his followers that impression. It may be conceded that this was the view of the multi-

tude, but Jesus is not to blame. He had done everything to make them think otherwise. We cite his whole ministry and teaching of a spiritual kingdom up to this time and, especially, his decisive action in the crisis at Capernaum; the peaceful emblem of the ass and the fact that his followers had no weapons but palm branches, cf. John 18: 36; Jesus' tears and lament over Jerusalem (Luke 19: 41–44) which was not about to be saved by a conquering Messiah, but about to be destroyed by its enemies; and, lastly, his failure to follow up the Triumphal Entry by energetic measures. At any rate, the people were soon to be undeceived by his words about tribute to Cæsar and by the cross.

During Passion week, he was asked about paying tribute to the Roman government. It was a crucial question. If he should fall in with the popular view of his Zealot followers and take sides against paying tribute, he would immediately be involved in a nationalistic political movement, which could mean nothing else than treason to Rome, and, therefore, either success as a warrior Messiah or a traitor's death. If, on the other hand, he should advise paying tribute, he would

appear a traitor to the dearest national hopes, and would take the heart out of the once more enthusiastic multitude. He did not hesitate a moment. He chose the latter course, which left him without enthusiastic friends, but left his enemies without a charge which they could prefer against him before the Roman governor.

This was a source of the most serious embarrassment to the Jewish leaders. Even before their own court, dependent as it was on the Romans, they were at a loss for a charge against this simple preacher and prophet. Finally, they condemned him to death for blasphemy, on his confession of his Messiahship. Yet they could not execute their own sentence, but must hand him over to the Romans, and blasphemy was not a capital charge in a Roman court. They, therefore, charged Jesus before Pilate with claiming to be a political Messiah ("Christ a king," Luke 23: 2, cf. Mark 15: 2) despite his answer about the tribute. Pilate is not inclined to take seriously such a charge against this simple but impressive peasant, and, after Jesus' private explanation that his kingdom is not of this world (John 18: 36), is convinced of his innocence, and

yields finally only to political pressure and self-interest.

It is to be noted that Jesus died rather than deny that he was the Messiah. The solemn circumstances of his final confession (Mark 14: 60–64 and parallels) have already been described (p. 36f.) but must be repeated here. He stood before the supreme court of his nation; the religious and political head of the nation, the High Priest, put the question; Jesus was under oath; he knew that on his answer depended his life or death. He might have explained or equivocated, but he did neither. He said, "I am the Messiah," and more, "you shall one day believe it, when you stand before my judgment seat, as I now stand before yours." The charge made before Pilate shows that he was condemned as a political Messiah, a traitor to Rome. And the title on the cross, the bitter sarcasm of the unwilling but weak judge, completes the proof of it. It was a false charge, and both the Sanhedrin and Pilate knew it. Still Jesus had laid himself open to it by applying to himself the Messianic title in a sense different from that in which it was popularly used.

We have noticed in Chapter III that, in the development of Jesus, his sense of a blessed, intimate, unique filial relation to God was the root of his belief that he was the Messiah. And although that belief was inevitable to him in his environment, and necessary to his self-expression, still it must be said that the Messianic title was inadequate, and always likely to be misunderstood. He was Messiah in his own sense, and he was not Messiah in the popular sense. He was Messiah, but he was more than Messiah. He was a personage greater than the race had ever known or imagined before. The large prominence which Jesus gave to the idea of the kingdom, and his remarkable reserve in using the word, Messiah, along with his evident consciousness of his own greatness, show that he himself was fully aware of all this. We do not now need the Messianic title to explain him. Indeed the title is Jewish, belongs to a past age and needs itself to be explained. The Church has been divinely guided in relegating it to history, and, for popular impression, calling him the Son of God and the Savior of the world. And yet, had he not used the title, we might never have seen that he was far greater than all that it implied.

CHAPTER V

HOW JESUS HANDLED LEGALISM

THE Judaism of Jesus' day was a retrogression from the religion of the Old Testament, especially from the high level of the prophets and the nobler psalms. It so exaggerated the ceremonial and legal at the expense of the moral and religious in the scriptures that almost the whole religious interest centered in the keeping of a set of precepts. Religion thus became externalized, mechanical, superficial, burdensome. Obedience to the letter of the law bade fair to become the whole of piety. Communion with God faded out of popular thought and language. The inevitable tendency was to foster self-righteousness, pettiness, hypocrisy, casuistry, and downright immorality. This system we call Legalism.[1]

The Pharisees were the especial exponents of this system, the perfect patterns of legalistic piety. They were the leaders of the people, and

[1] See p. 26f. on the Pharisees and Legalism.

generally admired and reverenced for their painstaking performance of the law. Yet we must not overdraw the picture. There were many devout men in Israel, who cherished true religion and an earnest morality even in that legalistic age. Not all the Pharisees themselves were hypocrites. There were great souls among them, like Hillel, Gamaliel, and Saul of Tarsus, but, as the last named said after his conversion, they were on the wrong track. The fact is that the Pharisees and their sympathizers had about all the religion that was left in Israel. At the time of the Maccabean uprising, true piety was like to perish from the earth, but the predecessors of the Pharisees saved it in that crisis by magnificent devotion and heroism. Pharisaism has been the backbone of Judaism from the days of Jesus until now, a potent though isolated force. Still most of the leading Jerusalem Pharisees of his time were all that Jesus painted them, proud, self-righteous, hypocritical, covetous and immoral.

Jesus nourished his soul on the Old Testament, which he knew thoroughly and quoted with perfect ease. He found in it a divine revelation. He never had a thought of setting up a new

religion with no root in the old. The Old Testament was his Bible, he recognized his Father in its God, and all he ever said which goes beyond the Old Testament was a natural outgrowth from it. It is probably true that in a general way he even accepted the Pharisaic theology except in those points in which he criticized it. The law and the prophets, as interpreted by the scribes, were the background of his life and thought. Indeed Jesus was brought up in the atmosphere of Pharisaism. Doubtless his relatives belonged to the circle of the Devout, and he breathed the freer air of Galilee, but the Pharisee was even there the beau ideal of the good man, and he himself would naturally have been of the same mind.

But, although growing to maturity in such an environment, Jesus was the instinctive foe of legalism. The simplicity, freedom, freshness and joy of his spiritual life, his unerring moral insight, the breadth of his mind, the universality of his sympathies, and the greatness of his personality were entirely out of harmony with the Pharisaic system. He could not be cramped and bound by that strait-jacket. He was sure to

rebel. The clash was inevitable and the breach, once made, could never be closed.

Jesus began his Galilean ministry and laid the foundation of his popularity by casting out a demon on the Sabbath day and healing a leper by a touch. These unlawful acts led the Pharisees to begin to watch him, and we can trace the history of their feelings through the stages of surprise, suspicion, criticism, bitter opposition and conspiracy to kill. These stages Jesus met by explanation, argument, demonstration (Mark 2: 1–12), appeal to better feeling and common sense, finally, however, by aggressive assault, open break and denunciation. Jesus' initial attempts to win at least the Galilean Pharisees are too frequently disregarded, but can be plainly seen in his first mild replies (Mark 2: 1–22, Luke 5: 39, 7: 36–50), and his tactful invitation to the Pharisees to come in and share the joy of the new kingdom (Luke 15: 25–32). It is clear that the Pharisees began the conflict by criticising Jesus and trying to force him to respect their views. Finally, however, Jesus carried the war into their territory, and with astonishing boldness attacked the whole system

of legalism, denouncing its advocates as hypocrites, worthy of the condemnation of God.

Jesus objected to the fundamentals of legalism: (1) to its externality, its conception of religion as a round of outward duties and ceremonies, its careful washing of the outside of the cup, but neglect of the things of the heart within; (2) to its lack of a real distinction between duties, all being in its view equally important as equally involving obedience to the law, until at last the pettiest prescriptions got the most attention, and ethics as well as true religion bade fair to be ignored; (3) to its casuistry, its endless hair-splitting, which rotted the very fibre of sincerity and candor, inevitably tended to hypocrisy and double-dealing and was a convenient and oft-used cloak for covetousness and lust; (4) to its burdensomeness, its impossible exactions, a heavy yoke which men were unable to bear and which banished all the spontaneity and joy of a genuine religion; (5) to its exclusiveness, its contempt for those who did not attain its standard, its critical censorious attitude, its remorseless condemnations, its holier-than-thou spirit; (6) to its self-righteousness, pride and ostentation, springing

out of its superficial externalism and exclusiveness. Since Jesus got through with this feature of Pharisaism, self-righteousness has never been good form. It has never recovered from the mortal blow he gave it, though under the guise of self-salvation it has again attained quite a vogue. (7) Jesus also objected to the legalists' thought of God, as a mere law-giver and judge, stern and unsympathetic, more concerned with the maintenance of law than with the salvation of men. Indeed Pharisaism so filled the whole horizon with the thought of the law, that the idea of God and immediate relation to him was shoved into the background.

No wonder that the Pharisees rejected John the Baptist and Jesus, whose religion was, in direct contradistinction to theirs, a religion of the heart, of the inner man; of indifference to ritual and ceremony in comparison with justice, mercy, faith and love to God; a religion of great principles of action, lived out in all sincerity, joy and freedom; of sympathy, self-sacrifice and love for the weak and the fallen. Jesus put his seal of approval on the humble heart, filled with a sense of its need, and hungering and thirsting after right-

eousness. His teaching of the Good Shepherd seeking the lost sheep and of the free forgiveness of prodigals, denied the fundamental premise of Pharisaism, i. e., that men could and must deserve and earn salvation by a record of external good works; and established forever the doctrine of God's grace or undeserved favor toward the repenting sinner. Right in line with this, he emphasized the thought of God, his nearness and love, his sympathy with men, and put the name, Father, into the foreground in all his speech. To Jesus' mind, fellowship with the Father was the most valuable and important thing in religion.

The whole manner of Jesus' teaching corresponded to his inner spirit. The Pharisaic teachers were really lawyers. Everything with them was second hand. They dealt in quotation, tradition, precedent. They were mere echoes of the Old Testament and the decisions of earlier scribes. They were always debating the same old questions of casuistry. They prided themselves on being cisterns, rather than springs. Jesus, on the other hand, was independent, fresh and original, a prophet rather than a lawyer. The people soon discovered that he spoke on his own initia-

tive and not as the scribes. He did not quibble or debate, but poured out of a great soul words of life and power. He did not deal with the minutiæ of conduct, but with the basic principles of action. He did not preach the letter that killed all freedom and joy, but the life-giving Spirit. Here was a new voice, a new method, a new gospel and a new tone of authority.

Jesus clashed with the Pharisees not only on the fundamentals, but also on the inferences and practical details of legalism.

The Pharisees had built up a whole system of traditional interpretation of the law, which they considered of equal validity with the law itself, and in practice more important. This tradition, as it was called, corresponds to the body of legal precedents and judicial decisions, which plays so great a part in our own courts. It originated in the desire to apply the law to all the innumerable vicissitudes of life, and was to a certain extent inevitable to a legal system, which lay back of the life of a people. The trouble was that its framers in the multiplicity of applications lost sight of great leading principles, and that this law was religious as well as social. As a result,

life was fettered just where it most needed to be spontaneous and free, and the tradition in many cases was a glaring reversal of the true spirit of the law. It was only "a tradition of men," anyway, and could not rightly be proclaimed as divine in its sanctions and obligation. Jesus did not feel bound by it. He repudiated its authority, and, what was more to the point, the authority of its makers, the scribes.

The law of the Sabbath was the masterpiece of the scribes for particularity, casuistry, absurdity and downright oppression. It aimed to decide in a binding way every possible question of conduct on the Sabbath. In the end, it was such a maze of disjointed precepts that no ordinary person could even keep it in mind; it made a good memory a prime prerequisite of piety. Jesus let in the light of religious common sense, founded all on the principle of a Sabbath made for man, appealed to the fair-mindedness of his hearers against Pharisaic bigotry and severity, and always won the day with the common people.

Jesus also opposed the whole teaching of ceremonial defilement, the law of clean and unclean. This was a peculiarly external piece of legal

mechanism, applied especially to foods, but also to touching unclean persons and things,—Gentiles and dead bodies, for instance,—and involved endless purificatory washings. Jesus seems to have openly disregarded it from the first. He ate with unclean publicans and sinners, allowed a sinful woman to touch him, himself touched a leper, and was careless about his ceremonial ablutions before meals. All these things he defended on the ground of his love for the lost and the necessity of saving them, and, as to clean and unclean foods, he practically denied the distinction and abolished that whole section of the law, declaring in general that legalism was a plant which his heavenly Father had not planted, and that it was bound for the ditch of destruction (Mark 7: 1–23 and parallels).

This last item brings up the whole question of Jesus' attitude towards the Old Testament Law. Jesus kept the law, both ceremonial and moral,[1] except as hereinafter indicated, and even bade his disciples keep the tradition too when not in-

[1] As a preliminary to the discussion it should be said, that however useful and justifiable the modern distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law may be, neither Jesus nor anybody else in New Testament times ever clearly made it.

consistent with morality (Matthew 23: 2). Only thus could he have gotten the ear of the people in that legalistic age. He was really more revolutionary in teaching than in conduct. Indeed he was at heart conservative in the best sense. To him the Old Testament was a revelation of righteousness. He felt that it was all summed up in love to God and love to man. He founded his whole life and teaching upon it. He maintained and exalted the moral law as no one before him had ever done. On the other hand, while he generally kept the ceremonial law, he laid no emphasis on it, treated it with indifference, and evidently took no interest in it.

Did Jesus in any particular abrogate the Old Testament law? The first chapter of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5: 17–48) is often cited in proof that he did. To be sure, we here see Jesus assuming authority as a teacher that puts him above Israel's great Law-giver. "Moses said thus and so to those of old times, but I say unto you." Yet Jesus begins the first great section of the Sermon by declaring that he had not come to destroy the law by loose interpretation, that the moral content of every least precept must

come to fruition, that he had come however to fill the law with deeper meaning and to carry it on to a new stage of development, and this, in 5: 21–48, he proceeds to do with a consciousness of power and profundity of moral insight which has been the wonder of the ages and secures the assent of every heart. It cannot be truly said that in this chapter Jesus abrogates the law. He deepens it, and makes it more positive and spiritual.

In the matter of the Sabbath, Jesus broke explicitly only with the scribal tradition, but the spirit of his teaching and the implications of his principles do certainly abrogate the severer and more particularistic Sabbath precepts of the Old Testament as well, and are inconsistent with much of the Old Testament point of view on the subject. The story of the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath (Num. 15: 32–36), for instance, is certainly not in line with the spirit of Jesus.

On the subject of divorce, Jesus appealed from the laxity of Moses, whom he excuses, to the more fundamental teachings of Genesis and Malachi. Fasting, to be sure, is only rarely prescribed in

the old scriptures, but Jesus would make it entirely voluntary, the expression of a spiritual mood.

There can however be no doubt or equivocation with reference to Jesus' attitude on the subject of clean and unclean. This is an Old Testament prescription. He not only disobeyed it by touching a leper, but distinctly abrogated the whole code, so far as it had to do with food at least. He here spoke as if superior to the Old Testament, and acted as though he were Lord in the sphere in which it had hitherto ruled supreme.

How can we reconcile his love and honor for the Old Testament, with this implied and open abrogation of parts of it? The answer is that he did not look on the Old Testament as a set of external precepts, a legal code, but he penetrated to its inner character and meaning. It was to him a book of religion. It was a revelation of God, of righteousness, of love, of hope. As such he honored and loved it. "It was as if he had skipped the temporary in the scriptures in the reading, so little did it interest or busy him." He was not a revolutionary, he built on the old;

but he was a progressive, he went on to the new. Yet he loved more to dwell on the old in the new light, than to set the new against the old as something opposite and antagonistic. Indeed he never did this except when forced to it. He was instinctively conscious of genetic and evolutionary connections, but when the old had had its day and stood squarely in the way of the new, he decisively swept it aside.

CHAPTER VI

JESUS' POSITIVE TEACHING

JESUS is rightly called "The Great Teacher," for, in the realm of religion and morals, he is absolutely supreme. The profounder side of life is his chosen sphere. He taught men how to live richly, deeply, nobly. "He made religion a new thing and transfigured the religious life." Yet it must always be remembered that he was not a teacher only or principally. He was also a man of character and a man of action. He founded the Kingdom of God. What he was, what he taught, and what he did, *together* constitute his title to be called Savior and Lord.

The originality of Jesus' teaching is not absolute. If it had been, it would have been partial and one-sided. Indeed he never claimed originality, but frankly founded his teaching on the great religious conceptions of the Old Testament. Many of his ideas may be found in the contemporary Jewish literature, rare grains of gold in heaps of sand, and in the works of Graeco-

Roman and Oriental sages, who lived before him. Yet it is most improbable that Jesus had ever read any of these sages or even heard of the most of them. He and they were dealing with essentially the same subject, and an occasional similarity in thought or speech is not at all strange. Yet in almost all these parallels, Jesus is the profounder, the more comprehensive or the more perfect in form. In fact, it seems as though in these other teachers, we see candles throwing their light out into the darkness, while Jesus gathers up all their partial truths with his own into one incandescent shaft of light, which turns the night into day.

Yet, in the large sense, Jesus' originality is incontestable. It consisted of four elements. The first was his matchless insight into the human heart, its motives and its needs. Those pure and loving eyes searched the depths of the soul, and he knew how to recreate men by the touch of truth and power. We wearily turn thousands of pages of pre-christian and non-christian literature to find a few gleams of such quick and sure intuition, as give every paragraph of Jesus' teaching real worth. Again, we wonder at his sense of proportion and relative value, which leaves the impres-

sion of unequalled sanity and penetration. This is all the more remarkable since the legalistic system of his day had lost all sense of balance, and was as badly awry and out of plumb as any system intelligent men have ever known. But with infallible accuracy, Jesus put first things first, and never failed to get at the inner principle, at the very root of the problem. The best illustrations of this are his discovery of active love as the guiding principle of a true life, and his indissoluble combination of religion and ethics, while reserving to religion a certain primacy, in his famous summing up of duty as love to God and love to man. This fine balance of duties to God and man is the profoundest and most valuable contribution to ethics ever made. Add to this, as a third element, a deep seriousness and unexampled moral earnestness, and we shall understand something of the impression of power, which his words give to every generation, a spirit and life which takes them out of the realm of the speculative and theoretical, and makes them a positive practical force in the world with a peculiar penetrative quality. His teaching is its own best praise. Its effect is the self-evidencing proof of its unique

character. Lastly, he was conscious of a sort of final authority. The tone of certainty rings in every utterance. God had sent him. A life built on his sayings is built on rock. The Judgment Day itself will not budge it an inch. If John the Baptist is the greatest of the prophets, he is more.

When we turn to examine Jesus' way of teaching, we see immediately that he never thought of constructing an ethical or theological system. He was the very reverse of methodical. Rather he was occasional, fragmentary, practical. He seized every opportunity for inculcating his truth. He used the language of the common man and his thought moved along popular lines. He understood the value of the short pithy style, of illustration, of the story. His matchless parables reveal his delicate appreciation of the hidden harmonies of nature with the deeper things of the kingdom and of the human heart, his wonderfully accurate observation of common life from every side, and his exquisite sympathy with men, birds, fields, sea and sky. He used the acted parable with equal power, as when he washed the disciples' feet for a lesson on loving service,

presented the deepest things of his religion under the symbolism of the Lord's Supper, or withered the fig tree by the wayside. Along with the striking and beautiful parabolic form, he was the master of spiritual apothegms. They stick in the mind like burs in the clothing, and he meant they should. The world will never forget the Golden Rule, his summons to supplication, "Ask and ye shall receive," and his high ideal, "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect;" while the Lord's Prayer seems ideal in brevity, simplicity, comprehensiveness, spirituality and uplifting power. He is often almost poetic, indulges in hyperbole, sometimes argues by the extreme case, and is never careful to define with exactness. There is nothing scholastic about him, he is never fanciful or flat like the scribes, but there is in him an elemental freshness, sanity and understanding which give his words a perpetual interest and charm. The reason is not far to seek. What he taught had not been learned from books, nor from other men, but was the expression of a constant inner experience of unique fellowship with his Father, and of a soul strong in love and purity. His heart spoke to

men's hearts with a directness, lucidity and simplicity absolutely unrivalled in the history of the world. And it went home and it goes home, because in it men seem to hear the voice of all that is purest and best. Consequently, if we would correctly represent Jesus, we cannot analyze his teaching after the style of modern systematic ethics or traditional theology, but will attempt to describe it as it lay in his own mind, so far as our fragmentary sources will allow.

The leading and unifying idea in Jesus' teaching is *the Kingdom of God*, a conception which he seized upon as the best expression of his experience and the object of his mission, and which he more or less transformed. As the phrase only imperfectly corresponded with his deepest thought, however, he said many things, which he doubtless did not consciously relate to it. Yet, as a matter of fact, nearly all his teaching may be so related without violence.

This phrase contains the two leading religious ideas of Jesus, and the more important of the two in his mind was God. The earliest, deepest and most abiding element in Jesus' experience was his fellowship with God (cf. p. 47ff.). Out

of this sprang the thought of his mission, and in it securely rested his whole life. Jesus' God was the God of the Old Testament, but he called this God Father. To be sure, this word is applied to God in the Hebrew Scriptures, in his relation to Israel, to the theocratic king and classes of individuals, but Jesus, with his wonderful sense of proportion, exalted this title to the first place, individualized it, and gave it a warmer, richer, more intimate meaning. As Father, God loves, rules and cares for his children; and they on their part owe him, as their Father, reverence, supreme love, obedience and trust. God is not far off, despite what the legalistic system tended to teach men, but near at hand, and intensely interested in their salvation and all their highest good. This teaching of the Fatherliness of God is Jesus' greatest service in the revelation of God to man. Yet, as the very phrase "kingdom of God" shows, the Father was in Jesus' thought the King,[1] the Moral Governor of the

[1] Sometimes Jesus makes God king in the kingdom, and sometimes represents himself as king. But there is no difficulty here. Just as the Davidic king was merely God's deputy in a state, which was essentially a theocracy, so Jesus is God's Messiah, and (deputy) king in the Messianic kingdom.

world, to whom men are responsible and to whom they must give account. Jesus never imagined that the ideas Father and King could ever be thought inconsistent with each other. To him, God was the Father-King. God, he taught, was holy, supremely good, perfect in every moral excellence, the basis, norm, and end of moral character, the absolute guarantor of the victory of the kingdom. On this account, Jesus made no sharp distinction between religion and morals. He knew no religion which did not go out in active love to man, which was not instinct with the impulse of duty to humanity. He knew no morals, which were not founded in the idea of God, and which did not continually draw motive and inspiration from him.

The Kingdom of God has already been explained (cf. p. 72f.). It is first of all individual. That man has entered into the kingdom in whose willing and happy heart God has begun his blessed reign, and this is evidenced by the loving obedience of the man to God. "To be in the kingdom is to be with God," to repeat in kind, if not in degree, the experience of Jesus. Yet the future will be still more glorious and blessed. The

kingdom has come, but is still to come, and the best is yet to be. It inevitably becomes social. These children of the kingdom will constitute a new and heavenly society on this earth, a society in which God will reign and which will do his will gladly and perfectly.

This thought of the kingdom is one of the most important ever given to men. History is not a monotonous round of ever returning cycles. It is coming out somewhere. The world is tending towards an ideal perfection, and that ideal gives it purpose and unity. God is not outside society, detached, vague and shadowy, but working in it and through it, actively engaged in its development towards this most blessed consummation of a glad and universal obedience and fellowship. So the world is to find its final unity and final blessedness in God. Nothing gives the Christian such patience, strength and joy as this thought.

This kingdom, Jesus taught, was of priceless worth to the individual and to society. It is a feast of blessings. In it he who sorrows over sin shall receive the peace and comfort of the divine mercy. He who hungers and thirsts after right-

eousness shall have the solid satisfaction of real moral attainment. The cleansed in heart shall have the vision of God, and shall know the deep joy of the divine sonship. Through the power of gentleness, God makes them the heirs of the world. This is life and life more abundant. No sacrifice is too great to gain it.

Jesus laid stress on the seriousness of the issue when the kingdom was offered men and they were invited to enter it. There were only two ways then, one led to life and one to death. That offer makes the supreme demand on men. To reject it even to gain the whole world is the most dreadful folly, for it means the rejection of the highest good—the throwing away of life itself. Better cut off the right hand or pluck out the right eye, than suffer such a final and irremediable loss. No more solemn words were ever spoken than those used by Jesus to emphasize and illustrate the gravity of this choice both for the individual and the nation. This note of the seriousness of life and its issues pervades the teaching of Jesus, and magnifies the value of the kingdom.

Jesus came not only to teach men about the

kingdom, but to induce them to come into it. In doing so he naturally laid down the conditions of entrance. These are variously stated and illustrated, but in each case the first step is repentance, by which Jesus meant a change of mind and heart and will towards sin and God. Looked at from the divine side, it is a new birth, the beginning of a God-given, new, and higher life.

This repentance unto life means definitely quitting the old life of sin and selfishness and beginning to do the will of God, not from necessity or as a burden, or with legalistic particularism, but gladly and freely, with a real appetite for righteousness and service. Jesus' insistence on righteousness can hardly be overstated. It is the theme of the Sermon on the Mount and the lesson of his most public and striking act, the cleansing of the temple. Jesus knew nothing of any incongruity between love and righteousness. Love to him was a part of righteousness, and righteousness the indispensable quality of love. In his mind, justice underlies benevolence.

This new life is the life of faith. Jesus saw the budding of faith in a consciousness of spiritual need, humility and the childlike qualities of

teachableness and open-mindedness. Its flower was trust in God's willingness to pardon and to bless, and its fruit was a complete surrender, a renunciation of self and all that stands in the way of the new life, a supreme devotion to Jesus and a readiness to sacrifice everything, even life itself, in following him and doing God's will. Of the completeness of this surrender in faith Jesus could hardly speak more strongly than he does.

This new life is also a life of love to God and man, and on this account must begin with the forgiveness of all who have done us wrong. Jesus is inflexible with reference to this initial test. Gentleness, mercy and peace are equally indispensable. Love is not merely benevolence, good will, but it is active beneficence, a real doing of good to all those about us. The children of the kingdom will, however, have a special affection for all who follow Jesus and show a special kindness towards them, just because they are his and are therefore brethren in an especial sense.

The condition of entrance into the kingdom is, then, repentance, a change from a life of selfishness and sin to a life of righteousness, faith

and love in the sense in which those words are used above.

Now this new life is salvation. He who enters upon it and continues in it is saved, now and for all eternity. He is saved from irreverence, unbelief, aimlessness, selfishness, sensuality, and all their brood of vipers. He is saved to fellowship with God and Jesus and all good men, to purity, freedom, peace, joy and love. He is given an unshakable rock of confidence and the noblest of all purposes. He receives a new spiritual and moral power, and triumphs in the hope of ultimate moral victory, not only for himself but for the race. If he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down, for the Lord shall make him to stand. The God who has bestowed upon him this wealth of blessing will not forsake his mercy towards him at any possible judgment day. Such is the teaching of Jesus.

Let us now follow Jesus as he more particularly describes the life of the children of the kingdom. His primary insistence here is not on outward duties but on the inner life. It is heart religion which he demands. The kingdom of God is first of all a spiritual kingdom within men. Jesus

begins at the center and works from within outwards. He cleanses the life at its fountain head. With unerring insight, he goes to the very root of the matter. He searches out the hidden springs of action in the thoughts, motives and desires of men, and judges the outer conduct by the inner intent. All sin and all blessedness proceed out of the heart. It is the cleansed in heart who shall see God. This innerness is the unique quality in the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven.

So Jesus puts truth first. He demands that a man shall be inherently honest with himself, and therefore, with others. There is nothing which he hates so much as a basic falseness, an unconscious but real hypocrisy. This subtle poison rots a man at the core.

Such fundamental honesty assures moral integrity. The man is no longer torn with conflicting emotions, conscience pulling one way and the desires the other. The purified will is the captain of the ship and directs it right on in spite of storms. So life gets a unity in the one supreme purpose of the loving heart to do God's will and finds a simplicity and peace which cannot be had in any other way.

From this results Jesus' demand for spiritual independence, that men shall judge and choose in the spiritual realm for themselves, that they shall see things in the clear light of truth simply and as a whole, and that they shall act on the light they may gain. This is the root of that spiritual freedom which refuses to be bound by external authority, and is the mainspring of intellectual no less than religious progress.

It is no wonder then that Jesus, who sees in the human heart the seat of morals and religion, should have exalted as no one before him the value of a man. Man, in his view, is incomparably superior to inorganic nature and animals. Human rights always take precedence of property rights. He thought men well worth dying for. One human soul is worth more than a whole world of things. This is the source of the Christian ideas of reverence for personality, of democracy, of the equality of the sexes, the rights of children, the Christian home, and the demand for a new social order.

The life of the children of the kingdom, while fundamentally a life of honesty and independence in the spirit, is also the life of love. God loves

his children, and they love him, their brethren in the kingdom, and all men, even enemies. God loves his children more than any earthly father can. He understands them, will care for them and protect them, will hear their cry, and stands ever ready to help them. Their welcome home when they come back to him as sinners shows what sort of a Father he is. Nor will he ever allow those who have trusted his love to perish. On this assurance, Jesus bases his teaching of immortality (Mark 12: 26f.). Yet this is no easy-going, indulgent love, indifferent to principle and the highest good of the children, but "the firm and steadfast administration of a holy household," where the Father is supreme and his spirit is the accepted law.

Jesus' heart glowed with God's love for his own. He is the Good Shepherd, who seeks and saves the lost even at the cost of his life. He identifies himself with his disciples most intimately. Those who reject them reject him, and those who do them the slightest kindness because they are his, do it to him. With jealous love he denounces his direst woes upon him who shall cause one of the least of them to fall into sin. He promises

his continual presence with them. He will never fail them.

God's children also will love. The first commandment and the second, too, is, "Thou shalt love." It is the law of the kingdom. They love God. This is the foundation of everything in the spiritual realm, underlies all thought, feeling and action. It is the first instinct of God's child, and carries with it trust, obedience and reverence.

They love Jesus in whom they see the love of God. They follow and obey him at any cost of sacrifice or suffering. They stand by him, when all the world deserts him. They bring their precious ointment and pour it on his feet, and on his head, and he thinks that they do well. They lay down their lives for him and he thinks it fitting that they should. Again and again Jesus demands a love that shall be faithful unto death.

They love their brethren in the kingdom, brethren indeed, joined by closer ties than those of the flesh, having the same experience of God's grace and Jesus' love, the same inspiring task, the same blessed hope. They love all men. Love of neighbor is the second great commandment. The Golden Rule, while essentially a rule of

justice, is its practical principle. The neighbor is the man who needs us, whether friend, stranger, alien or enemy. Yes, Jesus requires his followers to love even enemies, who are actually striving to ruin and kill them. This love, however, is no sentimental feeling (we cannot enjoy our enemies), but an active doing of good. The children of the kingdom will be gentle, kindly in judgment, forgiving, compassionate, peacemakers, reverent in feeling towards personality, and will ever be giving to the very limits of generosity.

Indeed, the condition of rank in the kingdom is not wealth, intellectual ability, power, or even length or difficulty of service, but a loving heart which ministers in a lowly spirit to the good of men. No one thing in this connection is more emphasized than this, and here Jesus presents himself as the great example.

The life in the kingdom is presented from other points of view, all more or less related to those already mentioned. It is a life of sexual purity; Jesus goes out of his way to reiterate this. It is a life of rest to the soul, of real and abiding peace, of deep and lasting joy. It is a life of

freedom from care and anxiety; of faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness and love, of the cause of Christ and God; of patience and courage in the spiritual conflict.

Its external religious duties are very few and simple. Towards God, prayer seems to be the only one urged on the disciples. Towards men, all duties may be summed up in loving service in the spirit of humility, and yet the greatest service we can render is often made prominent, i. e., preaching, making known and communicating to others the unspeakable gift of life which we have received in our entrance into the kingdom.

Yet we do not correctly represent Jesus unless we remember his insistence on doing God's will. The right state of heart is only the necessary preliminary to this. The life of the disciples of Jesus is to be both active and contemplative, but the emphasis is on action. With Jesus, too, the will is king. He insists on choosing rather than drifting, on doing rather than professing. Indeed he anticipates our modern psychology, and declares that men will learn God's will by doing it, will come to certainty and depth of ex-

perience by walking in the path of loving obedience. Jesus never thought of offering a substitute for real objective righteousness.

The attitude of the children of the kingdom towards life and society needs more than a passing word. As we have said, Jesus' primary concern was with the inner nature of the individual man. He sought to make men reverent, pure, honest, just and loving by bringing them into a new relation to God. His first care was character. But just as soon as men were renewed in the spirit of their minds, their relation to life and men around them was necessarily changed. Their life in the family, in business, in the state, would be different from what it was before. There would be new motives, new ideals, new viewpoints, new energies. Jesus' insistence on active love, not merely to brethren within the kingdom, but to strangers, Samaritans and even enemies, shows his general attitude. He was generally content, however, with inculcating a spirit. Only rarely did he deal with particular practical problems, yet these rare instances prove that he recognized and expected that the principles he had taught would have a direct and decisive influence

on social relations. He spoke only once about the State (Mark 12: 17). It was a conservative word, when the radical word was anticipated by his foes, and yet it had in it the seeds of some of the finest modern developments in government. He spoke repeatedly and emphatically about marriage and divorce, upholding the highest ideals with reference to them in a lax age. His most frequent and most scathing social utterances were, however, reserved for the sin of covetousness. So strong are his words against riches that he has been claimed by modern agitators as their rightful leader in their war against property, and has been weakly defended by some social conservatives as giving us a temporary code of morals, fitted only for the brief interval which he thought would elapse before the end of the world. But Jesus never thought of an end of the world in any such sense.[1] The kingdom of glory which he would bring in at his coming would be a kingdom on this earth, a new society of men and women, in all essential features like the kingdom he was setting up during his earthly career, but purified and relieved

[1] The words "end of the world" should always be translated "consummation of the age."

of the incubus of evil. Society would not "end in a crash," as some say that he taught, but would go on at a higher level.

Moreover, both social radicals and conservatives interpret Jesus' words with too bald a literalism and without regard to his fundamental attitude and purpose. In his care for the spiritual development of men, he saw that their only salvation was in putting God absolutely first. Men could not be bond-servants of both God and mammon, for their demands were often opposite, and if they tried to worship both, money was sure to win them in the end. The opinion which puts material things,—food, clothes, money, comforts,—above God, the kingdom, character, society, love, and justice, Jesus set out to reverse. He found wealth, and the intense desire for it, his greatest foe in this endeavor. It was almost impossible to make rich men see what he wanted, or to enter into the new life that he opened before them. In some desperate instances, he told them that their only salvation was in giving it all away and starting afresh and free in the new path. Yet he did not say this to all, nor make it a universal demand. He had rich men and women

among his disciples, and always conceded the need of bread and clothes and money. Lately we have been told that Jesus preached a renunciation of the world of such a character that to follow him would break up society. But this also is untrue. He did demand a renunciation of self (Mark 8: 34), of the selfish life, of all that is sinful and wrong. And this renunciation of self and sin is revolutionary in its influence on the world. Jesus said it would bring in a new age. It has already done so, and will work increasingly from the present day on. But Jesus did not bid men renounce the good in the world. He loved nature, he loved his country, he did not withdraw his disciples from life but bade them fight the good fight in life's swirling currents, he recognized the State, he refounded the home, he blessed marriage and children, he enjoyed all of life's innocent pleasures, he made life richer, fuller and nobler. So far as world-renunciation and world-affirmation [1] are concerned, he held that even balance of sanity, which did not fear

[1] World-affirmation is a somewhat recent technical word, invented as an opposite of world-renunciation. It expresses the attitude of the man who thinks this a very good world and is not disposed to deny himself any of its pleasures.

to bring in the radical change, and yet appreciated and conserved all that was good in the existing order. When he says that his kingdom is not of this world, he refers to its heavenly origin and its spiritual (non-political) character. He never denies, however, that it is his purpose to build a new world in the midst of the old one, a new world into which the old must come or be doomed.

But what was the relation of Jesus to the Kingdom of God? [1] The answer is full and plain and makes up a very considerable part of the teaching of Jesus. To be sure, as we have pointed out, he at first and always spoke more of the spiritual kingdom, but afterwards frequently of the spiritual king. His relation with God was intimate and basic. God was his Father, had sent him, given him an experience of blessing, had filled him with the Spirit and with power, had endued him with all the resources of spiritual knowledge and energy necessary to his great work of salvation, and had guaranteed its ultimate success. No less a term than Messiah could

[1] Jesus' teaching on the Method and Progress of the Kingdom is more appropriately treated in the next chapter.

possibly describe him and that was inadequate. So he was the Son of Man, the Son of God, the Savior of Men, the King in the Kingdom, and the Final Judge. Though his mission, he finally saw, could be accomplished only through his death, he was certain that he would survive death, and in a future and glorious consummation finally and perfectly set up the kingdom, and reign in it as king.

Indeed this kingdom was only God's reign in the humble and loving heart, with all its blessed social consequences. To enter it was but to enter into the delightful experience of God, which Jesus enjoyed. So the kingdom came with him, and could increase and strengthen only as the enjoyment of his experience was shared by an ever increasing multitude. This new life, shared with Jesus, found its source of supply in Jesus himself, in communion with him, and through him with God. The Lord's Supper can mean nothing less than that the disciple is to nourish his spiritual life by a constant appropriation of the spirit, purpose and self-sacrificing love of Jesus.

Therefore salvation is in Jesus. To love him, to follow him, to obey him, to cleave to him, to

get his experience and to share his purpose is life. He is the way to God. To reject him is to choose spiritual death. He is the touchstone of destiny.

CHAPTER VII

JESUS' WORK AND HIS VIEW OF ITS FUTURE

JESUS was more than a teacher, he was a founder. He must rank with the great empire builders; but he was greater than they, for he founded a spiritual empire by spiritual means, an empire which he still dominates and guides, and which still increases, centuries after their temporary structures based on force have dropped to pieces. This is directly in line with one of Jesus' favorite passages, Dan. 7: 13, 14. He founded this empire or kingdom, as he called it, by giving men a new spiritual life, fostering that life, and finally sending them out to build the kingdom by communicating their new life to others. Despite all that may be said for Peter, John and Paul, in a real sense Jesus founded it alone.

Now let us look at this great work of Jesus, as presented to us in the gospels and especially as viewed by Jesus himself.

First of all, he believed that he was founding *God's* kingdom. God was behind him in this work. It was his Father's business, God had sent him. The Spirit was upon him, had anointed him, and worked in and through him. All the future lay in his Father's hands, and he was content that it should be so.

The character of the work is plain. It was an aggressive ministry. He sought men. He did not wait for men to come to him. He went after them. So it was an itinerant ministry. Ceaselessly he pursued his preaching tours, from village to village, from city to city, from province to province. He covered all the major divisions of the Jewish fatherland, Judea, Galilee and Perea, and preached also in Samaria and Philip's tetrarchy. He strove to come into personal contact with just as many people as possible.[1] The white harvest was ever before his eyes and on his heart. He prayed for helpers and urged

[1] The thoroughness and comprehensiveness of this speaking campaign has rarely been equalled. Where did Jesus get this aggressiveness? It was peculiarly foreign to the circle of the Devout from which he sprang, and in striking contrast to the quiet years at Nazareth. Jesus himself ascribes it to the Spirit (Luke 4: 18). It clearly testifies to his early certainty and definiteness with reference to his divine call and mission.

others to pray for them. No difficulties or weariness held him back. Over the mountains and through the wilderness the Shepherd sought his sheep. He sent out his still ill-prepared disciples by the dozen and the seventy on the same mission. From the very first he had intended to make them "fishers of men."

It was a preaching ministry. Preaching was Jesus' principal, and, except healing and helping, his only method. As the great sower, he sowed the divine word or message in men's hearts, the message of the kingdom and its new and blessed life. He urged men to enter the kingdom, told them how to do so, and solemnly warned them of the consequences of refusal. He revealed to them the father-heart of God, bade them cast aside the weary yoke of legalism, and find rest in his experience of joy and his new service of freedom.

The ultimate object of this ministry was salvation, to save men and society from falseness, selfishness and irreligion, to truth, righteousness, love and God. So Jesus sought sinners, promised them on the condition of repentance the divine welcome, a Father's forgiveness, and a rein-

statement in his favor, constantly alluring them by the blessedness of the life of the kingdom here and hereafter. On the other hand, he plainly warned them that it meant self-renunciation, danger, poverty and possibly death. Yet to lose life for his sake was to find it.

It was a ministry of love, of healing and helpfulness. Conscious of extraordinary power and compassionate by nature, Jesus could not but heal the sick and free men from the dreadful demon possession. He rejoiced in this power to help, he even saw in the casting out of demons the evidence of his victory over the powers of darkness and evil; but he also recognized the danger that by the indiscriminate and continuous use of his healing ability, he might give a wrong impression of his real object, which was not after all the curing of men's bodies but the setting up of a spiritual kingdom of spiritually renovated men. So, towards the close of his career, we find, in our records at least, ever fewer miracles of physical healing.

His ministry had a truly universal character. Offering a purely spiritual good, the kingdom, on purely spiritual conditions, it could not be otherwise. Jesus was one of the Jewish common people

and he loved them. From the very first he had not the slightest idea of allying himself with the narrow fraternity of separatist Pharisees or gaining recognition in rabbinic circles. He was frankly a common man and remained so. His Savior-heart went out to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, who, he saw, had no shepherd. He came to preach glad news to the poor and neglected. He felt himself drawn to the "sinners," those who had given up trying to keep the law and its thousand refinements, and were looked upon as unclean by the Pharisees. They were not bad people as a whole, but were shut out from the religion of the day by the religious leaders, and were wandering aimlessly and hopelessly about. Jesus became the shepherd of these people, presented to them his glad news that legalism was not religion, but that the highest spiritual good could be had by the sincere and childlike, who would begin a life of inner honesty and love to God and man. And they received his message. Into this circle he drew the publicans, the small practical politicians of the day, who had turned their back on Pharisaic exclusiveness and Zealot dreams as unremunerative, and

were in life for what they could make out of it. Many of them received him gladly and one of them became an apostle.

Nor did Jesus confine himself to these. Contrary to the law, he laid a sympathetic hand on a poor leper. He invited the harlots to come into the kingdom and they came. He offered a Samaritan woman the water of life and had an open heart towards all her hated race. He healed the servant of the Gentile Roman centurion, started to enter his house without a thought of defilement (cf. Acts 10: 28, 11: 3), and praised his faith as greater than any he had yet found in Israel. But Jesus was no class Savior. He sought to bring even the Pharisees into the joy of the kingdom. He pleaded with the Jewish senator, Nicodemus; he was at home with the well-to-do family at Bethany. Of the rich young ruler alone, it is said in the Synoptists that "he loved him." [1] He neither courted nor shunned any particular set of men. He sought nothing less than the salvation of the nation as such.

[1] Mark 10: 21 (no parallels). John 11: 5 tells us that Jesus loved Martha and Mary and Lazarus, also prosperous people; the Fourth Gospel too sometimes speaks of "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

This conclusion with reference to the universality of Jesus is seemingly opposed by two passages, Matthew 10: 5 (no parallel) and Matthew 15: 24–26 (Mark 7: 37). The former, however, which bids the Twelve avoid Gentile or Samaritan territory on their preaching tour is fully explained by the inadvisability of sending men still full of Jewish prejudice to preach to outsiders. The latter passage, in which Jesus says to the Syrophœnician that he is sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, is more difficult. It probably records Jesus' feeling about the limitations of his own mission, which at that period especially he could not transgress without serious harm to his ultimate purposes. A Gentile mission at this crisis in his career would not only have rendered a final appeal to the nation impossible, but would probably have strained the disciples' faith to the breaking point. But here too, it must be noted, the wise love of Jesus found a way. The woman's faith, Jesus intimated, showed that she belonged to the spiritual Israel.

As we have seen, the ministry was not much more than half over, before he became convinced that his violent death was inevitable. He was

sure that God had sent him, and he could not stop. Yet his continuance in the work constantly aggravated the bitter and murderous opposition of his enemies. There could be only one result, but, if so, death was a part of his mission, a part of the Father's plan for him, and, consequently, it must be *necessary* to the accomplishment of his great purpose of salvation. So he was certain at last that he could not save the world by preaching only. He must add to preaching the laying down of his life. He could save the world only by dying for it.[1] But *just how* his death was to save the world Jesus never said.

Only two passages can possibly aid us at this point. In Mark 10: 45 and parallel, Jesus speaks of giving his life a ransom for many, as the loftiest example of loving service. He tells us that his self-sacrificing death was a part of his mission, and that through it God would save "many," but the how and why remains a mystery. Mark 14: 24 and parallels at first look more hopeful. Jesus is speaking of the wine at the Last Supper,

[1] When this thought began to dawn on Jesus, he found Old Testament passages which confirmed it to his mind, especially Isaiah 53.

as the symbol of his shed blood. "This is the blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many," and Matthew rightly adds, "for the remission or forgiveness of sins." Jesus by these words clearly indicates that he regarded his death as a sacrifice. All sacrifices are more or less related to the forgiveness of sins, which is one of God's initial steps in the salvation of the sinner. Still, after all, the whole meaning may be nothing more than that through the offering of his life as a sacrifice, salvation will come to the world, and we make no progress in trying to answer the how and why.

The only real items of information which we get from this passage are the facts that Jesus looked upon his death as a covenant sacrifice, which actually founded the new community, the new Israel; and that in this symbolism he expressed the power of blessing which he expected from his death. Just as they drank the wine of the cup, assimilated and made it a part of themselves, so his disciples must partake of and appropriate his spirit which does not refuse the supreme sacrifice for others' good. Only thus can they nourish their own spiritual lives or

have a part in the new kingdom of self-giving love. They too must add sacrifice to preaching. This is profoundly significant. It founds Christianity not on a teaching, but on a person and an act.[1] That person and act must live again in Jesus' followers. Possibly we begin to see an answer to the how and why, but not as clearly as we would like. Possibly Jesus could not produce in this world by any other means except his self-sacrificing death that new type of character which would be dead to all the claims of self-interest and self-gratification and would gladly devote and lay down life itself for other's good. And such a life of self-sacrifice in lowly service to man and loving obedience to God and duty is salvation.

Gethsemane and the cry on the cross, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" still call for explanation. Up to the time of the midnight hour in the garden, Jesus had proved himself to be the bravest of the brave, always decisive, always master of the situation. Why then this agony of

[1] We may here aptly repeat the old story of the young man who came to Rousseau, no friend of Christianity, complaining that after ten years of labor he had not gained a single convert to the new religion he had invented. "If you will be crucified and rise again the third day, you will have no difficulty," answered the old philosopher. A deeply significant reply.

soul in prospect of the nearer approach of a death which he had long anticipated and had come to Jerusalem to meet? Was this an hour of weakness, of faltering before a reality, of which he had spoken bravely enough when it was at a distance? No, we cannot believe that Jesus faltered where many of his followers have sung hymns of triumphant faith. The cry on the cross explains Gethsemane. In the garden, he found in the cup which he was about to drain something more dreadful to him than physical anguish and death. That something was the clouding of the perfect communion with his Father, which he had enjoyed from his earliest recollection, which was more than life to him. He had never anticipated this before that final night. It was something absolutely new and strange to him, and he shrank back from it till he learned that it was the Father's will, the only way of accomplishing his mission and securing the salvation of men. The why he never learned, and still asked, "Why?" upon the cross, where at last in those hours of darkness he suffered the dread reality of which Gethsemane was but the warning shadow. And men ever since have

asked, "Why? Why was it necessary?" Possibly that our leader might go to the very limits of self-sacrifice and submission to the Father's will, that he might taste a bitterness in death of which none of his followers can possibly find the equal. He will not ask us to tread where he has not preceded and outdone us.

And this may not be all. For a time at least Jesus was in the sinner's place in that there was a cloud between him and the Father. We cannot believe that the Father was, as a matter of fact, angry with his Son, now suffering in obedience to him. But the Father did allow the cloud to come between, and to Jesus it was all real. Was the cause merely physical, some profound nervous depression? Even so, it was the bitterness of death to him, and God allowed it to be, as part of his plan. And just what was the cloud? Was it the cloud of sin? If that is true, it could not have been his sin, for he had none, but ours. And so we are back at the fifty-third of Isaiah again. It is to be noted that this chapter was very much in the mind of the earliest church, and very likely of Jesus himself in this very connection.

But whatever we may think or say about it, the cross has been the greatest element of power in the gospel. In all the long history it has awed, allured, melted and conquered men's hearts. Paul is not wrong when in Romans 8: 3 he declares that by the death of Jesus, God had done a hitherto impossible thing, he had by one act forever condemned and broken the power of sin and selfishness. By this act, Jesus bound the strong man, and from that day, proceeds to spoil him of his goods. The powers of evil can never recover from that deadly blow, but are bound to fall at last as the result of it. In the blaze of the light from Golgotha, all the beasts of darkness will finally creep into their holes, never to emerge again. The cross will yet make Jesus the Lord of the world; by its power he will draw all men unto himself.

Jesus' view of the future of his work is not altogether clear and the subject raises many difficult questions much debated by scholars. The first of these questions is whether Jesus intended to found a church, and whether he foresaw even the separation of his disciples from Judaism. It is asserted by the more radical

critics that Jesus moved wholly in the narrow circle of Jewish ideas and customs, that he considered his mission limited to the Jewish people, that he was altogether an opportunist in his method, deciding nothing until the occasion arose but leaving all the future in his Father's hands, that the early disciples after the resurrection still considered themselves Jews and attended the worship of the temple, indeed that Christianity needed a Paul to shake it free from its Jewish exclusiveness. It is furthermore pointed out that the two passages in which the church is mentioned, Matthew 16: 18 and 18: 17, are peculiar to Matthew and are probably not the words of Jesus.

We cannot accept these views as a whole. The evidence gives us another picture. Pharisaism was practically Judaism. It had a predominant influence in the Sanhedrin, and controlled the whole synagogue and school system of Palestine. It permeated the whole thought of the people, and neither Jesus nor Christianity could finally unfasten its hold on the nation. The break with the Pharisees began with John the Baptist. He rejected them and they rejected him. His baptism practically created a new kind

of Jew, known as the disciples of John. Finding no welcome in Pharisaism, they clung together and long survived the death of their leader without being re-absorbed into Judaism. John thought those who received his baptism of repentance the true Israel and looked on the Pharisees as doomed to destruction. Jesus took the same view of the Pharisees. While he seems to have had some hopes of the Galilean and perhaps of the Perean Pharisees at first, his break with Pharisees as such was final and complete. They had and wished no part in his new spiritual kingdom, and Jesus prophesied their rejection by God and their irremediable ruin. On the other hand, he was gathering about him a band of disciples, among them many publicans and "sinners" whom the Pharisees counted unclean. Jesus, however, thought these disciples the heirs of the kingdom of God. He had originally called them in order that, after suitable instruction, they might help him in his work of preaching, might become "fishers of men," that is, missionaries or apostles, but, when he chose the Twelve, he probably already began to foresee that the nation as such would never be won from Judaism to enter the

new society. This choice of the Twelve gave his little band a sort of loose organization, and he made the education of these leaders one of the principal parts of his work. He had no idea of a reunion of his disciples with contemporary Judaism. Rather he predicted that the Jews would persecute his disciples to the death, and in the Lord's Supper, he bound them in a new covenant to himself and to each other, and thus formally founded the new Society.

Although Jesus was no revolutionary and frankly based his teaching on the Old Testament, he looked upon his mission and teaching as something new, and the Pharisees clearly recognized it as such. In his parables of the new patch on the old garment and the new wine in the old wine skins, Jesus declared that his new teaching could never be related to the old so as to become a part of it. Indeed Judaism would be destroyed, while he was setting up an everlasting kingdom.

How, then, can it be said that Jesus did not foresee the separation of his disciples from Judaism? And if he did get a vision of that, he must also have foreseen their future community

life. They had gained his view and his spirit, and must share his isolation and rejection. So long as they held to Jesus as Messiah, the Pharisees would bar them out and bitterly persecute them. It consequently seems as if Jesus must have said some such words as those recorded in Matthew 16: 18, "On this rock I will build my church." They not only fit the historical situation, but it practically demands them. By "church" Jesus here meant "sacred congregation," using the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew Old Testament word for the congregation of Israel. He felt that his followers were the true Israel, the heirs of the coming Kingdom. On Peter, the first confessor of his spiritual Messiahship, he will build of like living stones, his congregation, his church.

The church then began historically with the followers of John the Baptist, but developed under Jesus' teaching and leadership in Galilee and Perea, having few, if any, roots in Jerusalem and Judea. Yet while it was thus brought into being by John and Jesus, it was a formless thing, organizing itself around the Lord in the way of personal devotion, and recognizing after a fashion

the moral authority of the twelve men whom Jesus had made leaders.

Harnack and Pfleiderer cannot believe that Jesus had any such historical horizon as to enable him to foresee a Gentile mission, and by critical or exegetical methods they eliminate all passages which appear to ascribe such foresight to him.

We must here, too, start from the known towards the problematical. Nothing is more certain about Jesus than his breadth of mind, his depth of insight, and his sympathy with the despised and the outcast. He had an inward antagonism to all Pharisaic exclusiveness and contempt for others. This is a strong preliminary reason for believing that Jesus was interested in Gentiles, who were common enough in all parts of Palestine. Three great *a priori* arguments arise too from Jesus' historical situation.[1] First, the Old Testament is full of predictions of the conversion of the Gentiles. This is especially true of Isaiah, one of Jesus' favorite books, and the same thought is found in Daniel 2: 35, 44; 7: 14. The last is

[1] Care must be taken not to confuse the subject of the Gentile mission with the narrower question of the Judaistic controversy.

the Son of Man prophecy, which we felt justified in calling Jesus' guiding star (p. 86).[1] Second, those who believed in the coming of a political Messiah believed that he would conquer and finally reign over all nations. Indeed, the third temptation is based on this very thought. Would a spiritual Messiah expect to do less? Third, the Pharisees of Jesus' time carried on an active propaganda among the Gentiles, and had many converts. Jesus himself refers to their compassing sea and land to make one proselyte (Matthew 23: 15). Would Jesus have his "fishers of men" less zealous?

Add to these familiar elements of the thought-world of Jesus the fact that he himself spent some weeks or months in heathen Phoenicia and Syria after the crisis at Capernaum. Can we believe that he went through that experience without having his heart moved with compassion for the Gentiles, although it may not have been wise for him to give expression to it then? Note

[1] It seems clear that Jesus identified himself with Isaiah's Servant of Jehovah, who is represented as God's Messenger of Salvation to the ends of the earth (Isa. 49: 5, 6, and other passages). This is another strong proof of his consciousness of a world-wide mission.

especially that *before* he took this journey, he had been eager to help the Gentile centurion, who had asked him to heal his servant, and had been loud in his praise of the heathen's faith, nay, without hesitation was proceeding to enter his house, something which even Peter was loath to do years afterwards (Acts 10: 28, 11: 3), and was only stopped by the centurion's considerate message. The centurion knew the Jewish prejudice and would not permit Jesus to expose himself to ceremonial defilement. Note also that the Syrophoenician asked for help just at the beginning of this foreign tour. Many things combined to make her request seem untimely, but, as we have seen, Jesus reconciled his Jewish mission with his aid to the Gentile on the principle that faith rather than nationality admitted to membership in his new Israel. This incident in all its significance would go with him during his entire journey. Nor should it be overlooked that the visit of Gentiles from this very territory described in the twelfth of John is exactly in line with the foregoing.

The spiritual character of the kingdom which

Jesus preached and its spiritual conditions of entrance plainly implied the universality of its membership. And this is strengthened when we remember that Jesus absolutely repudiated the nationalistic ideal of Messiahship and the kingdom. This spiritual character of the kingdom made it the property of the poor in spirit and the pure in heart, freed men from all class distinctions and race prejudice, and brought them into a new world of love and brotherhood. Can we think that he who first gave the world this wonderful charter of spiritual liberty really did not understand its true significance or its simplest implications; that Jesus, the originator of the idea, comprehended it less clearly than Paul, its expounder? Furthermore, the universality of Messiah's reign is a necessary logical corollary of monotheism. If there is one God, he must be God of both Jews and Gentiles, and interested in the salvation of all. This is Paul's argument in Romans 3: 29–31. Could not Jesus also draw so plain an inference? There can be but one answer, and that answer is further confirmed by Jesus' acknowledged attitude towards Samari-

tans, whom the Jews hated certainly as cordially as they did Gentiles.[1]

These considerations make the reference of Jesus to the Gentile mission perfectly natural, though it is probable that the thought came into greater prominence after his foreign tour. This favorable feeling towards Gentiles gives point to his first speech at Nazareth (Luke 4: 24–29). The universalism of the salt of the earth and the light of the world (Matthew 5: 13, 14) is unmistakable. The reference to many coming from the east and the west and sitting down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven while the sons of the kingdom shall be cast out, in its immediate connection with the Gentile centurion's faith and in a passage critically unassailable, is decisive for Jesus' inclusion of Gentiles in the kingdom (Matthew 8: 11, 12; Luke 13: 28, 29). Being brought before governors and kings, therefore, naturally implies the mis-

[1] While Jesus never discussed the question of circumcision or pronounced on the issue raised in the Judaistic controversy, the evidence adduced above leaves us in no doubt as to whether Jesus would have sided with Paul or the Judaizers, had the question arisen in his day. Here Jesus, Stephen and Paul stand together.

sion to the heathen (Mark 13: 9; Matthew 10: 18). In these circumstances, we doubtless have a genuine saying of Jesus in the prophecy that the anointing by Mary should be heralded, wherever the gospel is preached in the whole world. And the entire discussion greatly strengthens the universal Great Commission of the risen Savior. We cannot doubt that "the world was in his heart." [1]

Jesus then believed that his disciples would separate from Judaism, would form a new community, the true Israel,[2] that this gospel would be preached among the Gentiles and received by them, and that all peoples, nations and languages would serve him (Dan. 7: 14, the "Son of Man" passage). Jesus therefore was the Founder of the Kingdom of God. We do not mean that God had not reigned truly but imperfectly in the hearts of Abraham, Moses, Samuel and Isaiah before this time, but we do say that Jesus definitely set before himself, as they did not, the idea of a

[1] Mk. 13: 10; Mt. 21: 43, and the numerous universalistic passages in John are omitted from the discussion, because they would carry little weight with those who take the opposite side, and some of them are possibly open to legitimate critical and exegetical objections.

[2] Indeed these changes had already occurred in principle and had been partially worked out historically.

concrete spiritual kingdom, which would take practical form as a body of men bound together only by spiritual ties, calling themselves brethren because all felt in themselves the working of the same new life; a definite body of people in the world but not of the world, having the one definite purpose of bringing the whole world to enjoy their blessing of spiritual life. This mission, which was his mission, he left at his death in the hands of a few ordinary men of a despised race, and with only an imperfect understanding of their task. But he trusted their faith and love and God's ability to use them in this high enterprise. This little band, which he still inspires with his life and energy, has become the dominant force in our civilization, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Jesus takes pains to describe the processes of the kingdom's growth. The influence of his disciples will be all pervading; like salt, saving the world from its corruptions, like light, bringing to all men the knowledge of the Father. The growth is from small to large, from beginning to consummation and ever from within outward. Jesus likens it to the mighty, silent, self-acting forces of nature. The parables in which these

truths are expressed sound almost like those of a modern evolutionist. Yet Jesus emphasizes the divine agency more than the human coöperation. The kingdom is God's, it is from heaven; the initial impulse, the fundamental energy, the power for consummation, are divine. Nor will the development be always even and peaceful. The kingdom is bound to enter upon a fierce life-and-death struggle with its environment, a conflict which will end in victory only after the most dreadful persecutions and martyrdoms. Jesus came to send not peace, but a sword.

As to the outcome, Jesus had not the slightest doubt. It will be a complete and final victory. But whether that victory is to be won before his second Coming is not made clear. On this point the evidence is conflicting and confused. The one passage which hints a pessimistic view, that the Son of Man at his Coming will fail to find faith on the earth (Luke 18: 8), is in all probability a very early interpolation from the margin of the manuscript. The Leaven, more or less supported by some other growth parables, seems to know nothing of the second Coming and to rely merely on the spiritual vitality of the

kingdom to carry it on to success by the use of preaching in its largest sense. On the other hand, the parable of the Sower teaches only partial success, and the Tares tells us plainly that wheat and tares shall grow together until the harvest. Yet these too are evolutionary parables of growth. The parables of the return of the householder, the king and the bridegroom likewise assert that they will find good and bad at their homecoming. Indeed, this is the predominant representation. It seems possible that the parables of the former type belong to the period when Jesus expected to succeed in his campaign of preaching, the latter sort to the time after he became sure of his death and as a result began to preach his second Coming to his disciples. The difference is not so great as it first seems, however. In both representations final victory is assured and, as it seems to me, by spiritual means (cf. p. 90f.).

However great the difficulties involved, the evidence seems to prove that Jesus looked forward to his resurrection as well as to his second Coming. And we cannot help asking, How did Jesus come to think that he would rise again? Of course, all good Jews of his time believed in

the resurrection at the last day, but Jesus anticipated for himself something entirely different, in fact, unique. This assurance was possibly the complex result of several lines of faith and feeling. Jesus' extraordinary career was based on his experience of perfect moral union and communion with his Father and his consequent call to bring men into that same experience. As he looked forward to a fast approaching death, and felt it to be a divinely appointed part of his mission of salvation, long since foretold in the Old Testament, he felt that death could not be the end either of him or his work. His cross might be necessary to the triumph of the kingdom, but could not be its consummation. That glorious kingdom of the future must lie beyond his death.

Further, he had first realized the kingdom in his own heart and life. The kingdom came with him. He had been its founder among men, had been the center of its life, power and righteousness. He was the Messiah-king. He could not conceive of the further development of the kingdom without him. He was necessary to it. God had called him for this purpose and there was no other to complete the task. So he felt that

death after all could not for any extended time sever his personal relation to the kingdom. Nor did he believe that his Father, of whose love he had never had the shadow of a doubt, would leave him the prey of death (Mark 12: 26f., cf. Acts 2: 24–28) or that he would allow the enemies of his kingdom the lasting triumph of the cross. These subjective feelings were justified by the history. All now agree that without the disciples' belief in the resurrection, all Jesus' work would have come to naught.

But, most important of all, Jesus felt within himself an indestructible life, a vital energy far above that of other men, a power which had brought health to ten thousand sick, which was more than a match for leprosy itself, which had even revivified the dead. He had indeed been a victor in his conflict with Satan, had bound the strong man and spoiled his goods by casting out innumerable demons, had defied and overcome all the powers of evil and darkness. He felt that, though he might die, death was not congruous with his nature and that he would snap its bond.

He therefore thought of himself as always continuing with his disciples (Matthew 18: 20; 28: 20)

to answer their petitions, to be their helper and leader in all their work of building the kingdom. To be sure, he would be present no longer visibly, but by his Spirit, who would dwell in their hearts, take his place, and do for them all that he had done during his earthly ministry, and more (John 14-16). So Paul calls the glorified Lord "the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3: 18).

And he would come again. We have shown (p. 91f.) that this is probably also a purely spiritual coming, but so personal that all would recognize his presence, and so dynamic as finally to extirpate all the forces of incorrigible evil, and lift the whole world up into a new age of spiritual power, that glorious final perfect stage of the kingdom, which the Father has planned. In other words, Jesus was certain of personal triumph in his mighty enterprise and a final triumph in spite of death, nay, through death, a triumph which God had pledged him in his very call, and which was as certain to come as God was to continue righteous and supreme. Representing all that was purest and holiest in the universe, Jesus was sure that "he must reign until he had put all his enemies under his feet" (1 Cor. 15: 25).

CHAPTER VIII

THE CHARACTER OF JESUS

WHAT Jesus was, was the root of all that he said and did. All he taught originated in his inner experience, and his life was the undistorted reflex of his heart. This is what gives him that indefinable charm of simplicity, naturalness and reality, familiar to all readers of the gospels. Clear waters flow from a pure spring.

The two foci of Jesus' inner experience were his Father and his mission of salvation for men (Luke 2: 49), but of these his Father was first. The deepest secret of Jesus is his relation to his Father. He could not remember the beginning of that divine fellowship, close, delightful, unbroken, reverent. He lived in the sunshine of his Father's smile. He was conscious of such a real unity of love, thought and purpose with God, that he could call him nothing less than Father, and himself nothing else than Son. His greatest happiness was in communion with the

Father. Prayer was his vital breath, the basic activity of his soul. His life was consequently a life of childlike trust in his Father's love and wisdom. Even when his skies darkened, and apparent failure and death loomed large upon his horizon, he still trusted. He knew that the Father's will was best, and left all the future in the Father's hands. Even in that last strange cry upon the cross, God is still "my God." Jesus cannot, will not and does not lose his hold on God.

In one of the few passages in which Jesus refers to his own inner experience, he tells us that his life had a joy deeper than all perplexity and sorrow, and a peace which the world could neither give nor take away. And this joy and peace sprang from his sense of his Father's love. That love was his life. He consciously lived and moved and had his being in God. Never the shadow of a doubt flitted across his mind. God was the bottom of his certainty, the beginning, middle and end of all things to him. He was incapable of a single thought or act, he heard or saw nothing which he did not instinctively relate to God. "He was as full of religion as a rose is of fragrance or a nightingale of song." What wonder then

that when he began his work, he knew nothing except heart-religion and proved the relentless foe of externalism and imposed authority, and that he founded his whole conception of salvation on the possibility of such a unique relation between God and man as had never been broached before.

Out of this blessed fellowship with the Father and his sense of the spiritual need of men, came Jesus' idea of his mission. He wanted all men to share the Father's love with him, and knew that all their sorrow, sin and fear would vanish as soon as they came into possession of what he had always enjoyed. And he felt that he must and could bring them into that blessed state. His deep love and regard for men permitted nothing less. This was his mission in the world. This was the work which God had given him to do, a work of salvation which included in it all lesser good. So he called himself Messiah, and Messiahship meant to him just this and nothing else. In Jesus' mind Messiah meant Savior, the One whom God had anointed to bring salvation to men.

CERTAINTY. Jesus was sure of God and of his

mission, and his certainty was and is one of the elements of his power. He knew God as well as he knew his mother. In fact, he says that no one ever knew God so well as he (Matthew 11: 27). His mission came with a "must." It was an inner necessity. He could not and would not hold back. Like all great men, and yet more surely than any other great man, he was positive that he had been sent into the world to do a definite thing and the nature of that definite thing was perfectly clear to his mind. His assurance of life beyond death and of the consummation of his work in his final Coming showed that his certainty stood tests such as no other man's faith in his mission has ever surmounted.

Courage. So he undertook his God-given work without hesitation or misgiving, in the naked strength of a mighty and noble purpose in which he rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory. He was filled with a high enthusiasm, which was tempered indeed by the events of the ministry, but ran more strongly when it ran deep. He was never discouraged, fretted or soured by opposition and seeming failure. He was aggressive from the very start and pressed

the work. No more tireless preacher ever lived. When enemies arose, he was not content merely to defend, but stormed their works and carried the war into Africa. There was about him a holy boldness which utterly disconcerted his foes, and eventually made timid fishermen into Sons of Thunder (Acts 4: 13). So sure of himself was he, that he sometimes seemed to risk all on a single hazard, and almost recklessly to defy his opponents to put him to the test (Mark 2: 9–12). He was the bravest of the brave. Almost single handed, he faced a nation, an age, a world, which was bound to misunderstand, oppose and hate him, and yet always with the same lofty courage. No forlorn hope was ever led more resolutely than the last march of Jesus' little band from Galilee to Jerusalem. The serene calm of Jesus before the Sanhedrin and Pilate, and on the way to the cross, will never cease to compel the world's admiration.

Jesus' simple confidence in his final triumph was superb. In spite of all outward defeats, he had in his soul a continuous victory of faith. Obstacles like the cross, unforeseen at the beginning, could not dim that supreme assurance, for it was

based on his Father's love for him and for men, and in an optimism with regard to our race, which had never before been cherished in a human heart. So, strange to say, he was not in the least nervous or anxious about the outcome. He never swerved a hair from the straight path of his purpose to gain a single convert, or to keep a multitude from deserting him. He was so certain of triumph that he could wait for it and bide the time when he could have it on his own terms. This is the finest patience, and patience is courage long drawn out, the last test of the bravest hearts.

Joy. Jesus was not only sure, enthusiastic, hopeful and brave, but he was positively joyous. It was the joy of certainty, love and strength; a Son's joy deeply based in his Father's affection, a Savior's joy in the rescue of the lost, a strong man's joy in a great and worthy task, in battling with the storm. So he partook with zest of life's pure pleasures; he enjoyed nature, children, friends, the busy world in all its phases. His spirit was fresh and exultant. The early days of the ministry seemed to him like a wedding party with himself as the bridegroom. Whatever

others might think of fasting, it was alien to his mood. Life to him was a continual feast and he so represented it. He wanted this happy spirit to be contagious (John 15: 11). He pleaded with men to enter into the joy (Luke 15: 28–32). "On the two occasions[1] when Jesus took special pains to justify his conduct to his enemies, he was really explaining why he and his disciples were so joyful." To be sure, as the ministry went on to its tragic issue, the tone of Jesus grew more solemn. He was indeed "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," but there is no contradiction here. Joy and sorrow are not enemies but twin brothers. Indeed in the midst of trouble and sadness, Jesus' joy only grew in depth and ripened into triumph as he became assured that he would gain more by his death than he ever had by his life. He came to rejoice in his great sacrifice as his supreme victory. On the last night, he could say, "I have overcome the world," and could leave as a legacy to his disciples not only his peace, but his joy.

Love. The call to the work of saving men to God and to goodness found a ready response in

[1] Mark 2:18–20; Luke 15: 1–32.

Jesus' tender heart. Love made him Savior. Compassion for men in darkness, perplexity, sorrow and sin constrained him to show them how to enter into light and certainty, joy and holiness. Thus love to men goes back to the beginning of his experience so rich in love to God, and proves itself one of the major constituent elements in his character.

His love was perfectly natural and simple. He loved men as men. He never asked why he should love men. He just loved them. They seemed to him to need love and he gave it without stint. Man seemed to him most lovable, more valuable than all else beside, a single soul worth more than a whole world. Before the shrine of every human heart he stood with reverence. He would not force open the door, nor do violence to the will, nor intrude upon the secrets of the unwilling soul. His respect for personality was perfect. That men were stupid, foolish, sinful and foul only made him the more eager. He was the physician for sick souls. He had no doubts that men could rise from weakness and sin into spiritual health and wholeness. He was strangely optimistic about the least hopeful cases. It was the faith of love.

Just because he held men so high, he sought their good the more earnestly and persistently. And it was no sentimental love that he showed and taught, but a love of deed, a true kindliness, thoughtfulness, a loving service which shrank from no sacrifice, a real doing of good. Nor did his love know any limits of class or sex or nation or creed. He had no race or social prejudices. He loved men for themselves, rich and poor, men, women and children, Pharisees, Gentiles and publicans, lepers and Sanhedrists, Samaritans, scribes and sinners, respectable and outcast, good and bad, friends and enemies. He loved them all and there was nothing which he would not do for their true good. And he who led this life of practical love also preached love as the sum of the whole Old Testament and of his new religion too, and along with love, as variation or by-product of it, he preached and exemplified gentleness, patience, mercy, charity, forgiveness, generosity and peace, giving these passive virtues for the first time a standing as indispensable to character. So he lived and preached and died to bring the reign of love into this old world of selfishness and greed and hate.

That this was no assumed and, as it were, professional love is proved by his entire character and career. Rather it was instinctive. He had a sensitive nature. He was no cold, detached, impassive philosopher or ascetic, a mere onlooker, while men strove and struggled. Rather he plunged into the struggle himself. His emotions were strong and warm. His heart was tender. He loved his friends. Bold and firm as he was, he suffered under opposition and hatred, though he did not allow them to narrow or spoil his life. He knew trouble and sorrow, and his sensitive spirit sometimes cried out in its pain.

He had a strong social nature. He loved the crowded streets, the feast, the wedding, the eager multitude and all the ways of men. To be sure, he often preferred to be alone on the distant mountain to spend the night with his Father in prayer, but, next day, refreshed, he was engaged again among the busy throng. Sympathetic by nature, he felt the need of company and the strength supplied by the presence of loving friends. No one more deeply appreciated the affection lavished upon him, but, on the other hand, he was free from the weakness of self-pity,

he knew how to stand alone. He loved nature and children too, as few in his day did, and as he has taught the world to do. This inborn love gave this Galilean peasant an exquisite refinement and courtesy. He was the first and foremost Christian gentleman of all time, and though he loved all, he was filled with the rarest chivalry for those who had no helper, for women, for the poor, the outcast and the fallen. The friendless, at last, had a great and tender friend.

This Jesus was incarnate love. He was absolutely unselfish. He had no ambitions to satisfy, he never gave a thought to riches, he sought no pleasures outside the one great work to which he had devoted himself with entire single-heartedness, the highest good, the salvation of men. He wanted nothing for himself. All he desired was to give, to help, to sympathize, to heal, forgetting all his own comfort, consuming himself in labor for others, and finally dying that they might live. He felt that he had so much of spiritual blessing that he could be lavish in its bestowal. He was the first great lover of men, and none of his followers has yet equalled him here.

And just at this point is solved the most serious seeming contradiction in his character. Jesus was great, and he was conscious of his power, as all truly great men are. He was Messiah, Lord and King, and this he asserted in no uncertain words. Yet he did not grasp at authority (Phil. 2: 6–8), rather he praised humility, and said that he was meek and lowly in heart. How can these two things coexist in one spirit? His love solves it all. He did not look on his Messiahship as a self-won dignity of which to be proud, but as a divinely given commission to be performed, a service of love to be rendered. To him, as we have said, Messiah meant Savior. There was no work so important or so lowly that he did not rejoice to do it. He washed the disciples' feet the night before he died upon the cross, and for him there was no distinction in kind between the two acts. So his greatness was in his power to serve. He ranks first in self-sacrifice. He was Lord because he was conscious of absolutely unequalled resources for effective results in his labor for men. And when he bids men call him Lord, he only asks them to reverence in him the supreme claims of self-denying service. He

is king, because above all others he is mighty in the power of his love.

Wisdom. Even Christian men think too little today of the sagacity and breadth of Jesus. In him we find the profoundest wisdom and originality just where, on natural principles, we should not expect it. It was an unschooled wisdom, the wisdom of the practical man, the wisdom of the spiritual man, not the wisdom of the student, and yet a wisdom greater than any scholar or philosopher has ever exhibited. It did not come from books, or from travel, or from wide experience of men and affairs. It seems to have been inborn. Everything in his age and country was against the appearance of such a wisdom. For here breadth seems to spring from Jewish narrowness, insight from legalistic externalism, and practicality from a system which had left common sense behind. Surely the people who sat in darkness saw a great light (Matthew 4: 16).

There is a reasonableness, sanity and self-mastery in Jesus which put him immediately in the class of great men, and before which all charges of being a visionary fall harmless. He

took large views. He refused to be caught in the eddies of the current of his times. He always sailed in midstream. He was calmly superior to the one-sidedness, the prejudices and the extremes of his contemporaries. He has commended himself to the better sense of all ages and races. The universal and eternal were strong in him. And this is the more noteworthy, when we remember his emphasis on the inner man, the spirit, and the life of prayer and faith. The temptation of such natures is always to extravagance and fanaticism, though it has often happened, as in the case of Jesus, that the most unworldly spirits have seen the nature and trend of real life most clearly. Jesus was indeed an idealist but he was under no illusions. He was led of the Spirit, but he never deserted the sphere of the practical. He was foremost in the ranks of progress, but he was no iconoclast. He made ideal demands, but, rightly interpreted, he never forgot that his followers were human after all. Indeed, there often appears in his teaching a homely common sense, which might almost be mistaken for worldly wisdom. This remarkable balance both in word and in action seems not to have been the result

of study or calculation, but to have been spontaneous and natural to him. He had that highest genius which enables a man to take in the whole situation at a glance, to see around things and behind them.

The man of balance is often cold, judicial and incapable of decisive action, but Jesus combined balance with enthusiasm, wisdom with aggressiveness, sanity with magnificent leadership. He made statements whose reasonableness none could deny, which yet set standards which none have ever reached. His breadth never dulled the sharpness of his cutting edge, nor did his largeness of mind ever paralyze his ability to give the smashing blow. As the result of a judicial outlook on the situation, he could wait, but none ever acted with greater decisiveness than he, when the time for action came.

In an age when precedent was everything, he had the wisdom and the firmness to be absolutely independent, allying himself or seeking alliance with no party, never compromising his truth for the sake of a following, never content with a partial success, never for a moment diverted from his great aim. Sometimes he is called a revolu-

tionary and this is as warmly denied. The debate is due to his instinctive equipoise. He saw the good in the old and loved it, he built the new upon it. He did not put the new and the old as such into opposition. Rather he would have had the old become new. He recognized that there must be large changes; against some excrescences, like legalism, he waged open war; but he strove to carry the Old Testament religion in its essence on to its consummation, to deepen it, to individualize, spiritualize and give it warmth, to make it positive and universal. He never admitted that his spirit was alien to the spirit of the Old Testament, and died because he still claimed to be the Messiah of the Jews. "He was the boldest of reformers and the finest type of conservative" at the same time.

In an age when men thought of nothing but precepts and external duties and refined upon them beyond endurance, Jesus steadfastly dealt with the inner man, and with great principles of life and conduct. He might have started a hundred useful individual reforms in Palestine, but he refused to be turned aside from his great work of recreating men, and thus making a new world.

This fundamental business was his one great reform. He would not be entangled in the details of politics, nor would he define narrowly the applications of his principles to the minor affairs of life. He left his teaching flexible, living, ever adaptable to new conditions, not tied to his age, which would soon pass away. He did this not so much with an eye to the future, however, as because he prized so highly men's spiritual independence, the value of the moral and spiritual self-education involved in applying these inner principles to the details and exigencies of daily living. This one thing evinces a penetration, sagacity and largeness of mind which make Jesus the supreme guide in the realm of religion and morals. The result of it has been that the men of every age have come to Jesus with their deepest problems, and have received an answer so profound and apt that it has seemed as if he spoke to them alone.

Possibly the finest illustration of Jesus' intellectual and moral poise is seen in his exquisite sense of proportion in the realm of truth, his genius for putting first things first, for bringing order out of moral confusion and thus substituting

light for darkness. His placing of religion and morals on a par and yet religion first, his balance between the individual and society, his equilibrium of the active and passive virtues, his combination of self-renunciation and a practical life in the world, are not only evidences of the highest wisdom, but are the richest blessings which the world has ever received from a teacher's lips.

Jesus' wisdom may be viewed too as insight. He seemed to see with perfect clearness into every situation, but especially into the soul of man. He is a greater "knower of the human heart" than ever Shakespeare was. With unerring glance he analyzes the hidden springs of motive and reports his analysis in such simple terms that men in all ages recognize in it a moral photograph of themselves. As John says, he knew what was in man. Indeed, he was the first discoverer of the infinite value and dignity of the human soul, of the common man, of the individual. So he began, as no other reformer before him had ever begun, with the common man. He was a common man himself. He knew, sympathized with and prized the common man. He made common men the leaders of his new movement. He loved

the crowds. His one great method was to come into touch with just as many people as he possibly could, and pour himself into them. He had the utmost faith in what men might become in fellowship with his Father and theirs. He therefore dared to try to attract them with a spiritual kingdom and to use spiritual means in so doing. He trusted everything at last to an appeal to reality and the deepest realities. This was an original and amazing venture, which could only prove its wisdom by its success. But it did succeed; it has succeeded. The world in our own lifetime, however, is only just waking up to its full significance, and now only beginning to give Jesus' experiment its full leeway. We agree now that men are infinitely valuable, that successful movements must grow from the people up, that spiritual means are the only really effective ones, and that, if the world is to be saved at all, it must be saved in Jesus' way.

It is simply of a piece with the foregoing, that Jesus had a wonderful way of seeing the central point in every problem, of cutting the Gordian knot of every perplexity, of answering questions in a way which left the old debate behind and

brought men out into the heavenly light of a higher world, and of threading his way through the mazes and complexities of his historical situation with a sureness which confounded his contemporaries.[1]

Jesus' wisdom was wholly practical; nothing abstract, speculative, dialectic here. Simplicity and directness were his method. He built no lofty pyramid of logic, nor did he even think of attempting a system. Such things were entirely foreign to his mind. Rather he spoke out of his experience of blessing straight to the hearts of men, and this, though unmeditated, was the highest art. Of all the world's greatest teachers, Jesus alone spoke so that the common people not only understood him, but were delighted with him. Not even Paul can claim an equality with him here. He told men what he knew and it had a wonderful self-evidencing quality. It gave an impression of reality, which, twenty centuries afterwards, clings to his words and gives them perennial freshness and power. He

[1] No illustration of this is more comprehensive than the account of the Temptation. His moral insight in detecting what was wrong in each subtle proposition was incomparably delicate and keen.

filled the world with a new and immediate sense of God, which it has never since lost. "He brought, as it were, the perfume of another and higher sphere in his garments, and it floated out upon the universal air." In the simplest, most direct way, he just told men how to live, and the loveliest and noblest characters of history have been those who have come the nearest to being and doing just what he said. He was a new type of man, and created a new type of humanity.

His astuteness consisted largely in doing the simplest thing, the thing which lay so near his hand, that most men would have overlooked it. He had new truth. Most other men in his position would have labored to create new terms to express it, and so would have had a futile, clumsy and unmeaning apparatus with no connection with the past and no appeal to the present. But such a method probably never occurred to Jesus. He found religious concepts already in use like Kingdom of God, Messiah, Father (for God) and salvation. He seized upon these, purified and elevated them, freed them from their errors and limitations, and made them speak a new and higher message to men. This was the only sen-

sible thing to do; it reveals the instinct of the practical man. The history of this process, traced in former chapters, shows in Jesus a genius, a breadth, a patience, and an ability in instilling new conceptions, which command the profoundest admiration.

Though Jesus had some tearing down to do, he did not delight in it, as do so many men with new ideas. Rather, his teaching and work were decidedly positive and constructive. He was one of the great builders. He laid foundations so broad and deep that his church has never needed to be anxious about their solidity and sufficiency. To be sure, he weakened the walls of Judaism, but, when the Jewish state fell in ruins, his own edifice already shone forth in beauty and strength. But possibly the finest illustration of his practical wisdom was his refusal to appeal to authority, to tradition, or even to lay final stress on the Old Testament scripture. He preferred to address himself directly to the conscience, the reason and the will. He evoked all the nobler emotions and rallied them on his side. Men felt that here was a new method, the appeal to truth, to common sense, to reality. It was Jesus' way. It is

sincere. It is effective. It is ultimate. If it does not finally succeed, nothing can.

In conclusion we may say, that whether we regard the character, the substance or the method of his wisdom, the world is still sitting at the Great Teacher's feet.

Power. Rising from a fresh and intimate study of the gospels, we must say that, after all, the dominant impression left by the portrait of Jesus is that of power, of the greatness and force of his personality. And this same feeling is expressed by Tennyson's famous line, "Strong Son of God, Immortal Love," and by Mark's first comment on Jesus, "He taught as one who had authority." Power is the constant impression made by him on the men of his time; on John the Baptist, on his disciples, on the multitudes, on his foes, on the Sanhedrin, on Pilate. Whatever his attitude towards Jesus might be, there was no one who was not deeply conscious of the vigor of his character. To the Galilean centurion, "he seemed like a commander who was born to be obeyed." The Gadarene felt that he was in the presence of one who could order out a legion of demons. He stirred the whole nation to the bottom, and

the chief priests themselves confessed that he was like to turn them out.

And Jesus was fully conscious of his power from the very beginning of his ministry. He knew that he had in himself resources more than sufficient for his great task. All the solicitations in the Temptation presuppose his power; the last one even implies his ability to conquer the entire world. Jesus does not deny that he can do these things, but he sees that they would involve misuse of power, and so refuses to engage in them. The personal moral problem for Jesus was largely one of self-restraint, of too much energy rather than too little. Note the names of strength and aggressiveness he gives his disciples; he calls Simon, the Rock, and James and John, Sons of Thunder. He made men strong. He had power to give away.

Jesus seems to have had perfect physical health. He was capable of long continued, strenuous labor, a kind of work, too, which called for large expenditures of emotion and sympathy and sapped the nervous force. Yet he was never ill and rarely tired. All he ever needed was a night's rest. With unimpaired energy he pressed the

battle to the very end. His body was of that noblest type, which unites all the more delicate and finer nervous mechanism with glorious physical strength. So he was a perfectly normal man, a man almost disconcertingly natural. He had the sanguine, fiery temperament, was enthusiastic, brave and hopeful. In his inmost soul welled a deep spring of joy. He had a sense of humor. He loved children and liked to watch their games. He was capable of a sternness of indignation against hypocrisy and wrong, which sometimes flared forth to the discomfiture of his foes. Yet all was under the control of the strong man. Irritability is the vice of saints and heroes, but Jesus seems to have been calmly superior to the little vexations which so frequently call forth an exhibition of the weaknesses of high-strung spiritual men. He seems to have had not the slightest trace of our modern neurasthenia. It is this self-mastery which peculiarly impressed his disciples. Matthew speaks of his quietness of demeanor and his gracious patience (Matthew 12: 19, 20); Paul of the mildness and gentleness of Christ, his "sweet reasonableness," as Matthew Arnold would say (2 Cor. 10: 1); Peter of his

composure and faith in the midst of suffering and his silence under insult (1 Pet. 2: 23). Jesus had a great, energetic, warm, aggressive nature, but he never let it carry him beyond the bounds set by love and self-respect.

He overflowed with vitality. He was a springing fountain of life and power. The sick were healed by his touch or even by his word of command. The sinful and discouraged went from his presence with a new purity and hope. In him, says John, was life. He came that men might have life and have it more abundantly. He was so rich in spiritual goods that he gave without thought, as it were, extravagantly. As in the case of all strong men, the multitudes gathered about him, hung on him, listened spellbound to his words, sought to share his wonderful energy.

Jesus strikes us as a man of unlimited and mighty resources. He never seemed at a loss. He always knew what he would do (John 6: 6). He dominated every scene. The shrewdest leaders of his nation found their most adroit schemes to entrap him as ineffectual as the green withes with which his foes tried to bind Samson. He

had a wisdom of simplicity and expedients of love in his heart, of which worldly men had never dreamed. Angry foes, with murder in their eyes, might surround him, but there was such authority in his very mien that they instinctively made a way for him through their ranks, and dared not lay a hand upon him.[1] The vicissitudes of his career were many and keenly felt, but he mastered every situation and solved every problem from the viewpoint of a higher sphere than this. Even when a defenceless prisoner before the Sanhedrin and Pilate, he is still the central figure, calm and undismayed. We feel that, after all, the silent sufferer is supreme. Though they seem to be judging him, he in reality is judging them and they seem to mistrust it. In condemning him, they are themselves condemned, and all the ages affirm the sentence.

It is not strange that this man of power should add to his certainty, firmness and consistent bravery a striking personal dignity, a sort of kingly bearing. There was no pride in it. He never acted a part. There was not the slightest

[1] Compare the similar escapes of the missionary Paton from the cannibals of the New Hebrides.

suspicion of pretension to a position which did not really belong to him. There was no service too lowly for him to render. He had none of the airs of the great, or any aloofness or austerity, yet his self-respect was perfect. It was the wholly natural dignity of true greatness, of simple integrity, of the seriousness of the highest purpose. It probably never occurred even to any of his enemies to trifle with him, till the rude underlings smote and mocked him at his trial. We instinctively feel that none of his disciples ever dared to take liberties with him. The only approach to it occurred when rash Peter attempted to dissuade him from going to the cross, and we all know how that resulted.

In other words, he was Lord. This, of course, was involved in his Messiahship and, especially, in his work as Founder of the Kingdom of God. And he was Lord from the first. John the Baptist intuitively felt his superiority and yielded to his preference at the baptism. The bartering crowd in the Temple owned his authority and fled at his gesture. The sons of Zebedee left their nets to follow him. He was always Master. No disciple ever questioned it for a moment, and

Jesus never waived his prerogative. He naturally and easily took and held the position. He never consulted with any of his disciples about his plans or methods. He never asked anybody's advice. He initiated all new movements on his own responsibility. He simply led the way and the disciples followed in his steps. He commanded and they obeyed. He called himself Lord and King and they accepted him as such.[1]

So he was the Leader, the absolute leader, and yet so unselfish, so fair, so sympathetic, so patient, so inspiring that no leader has ever since equalled him. He bound men to him with the bonds of love. In spite of disappointment, misunderstanding, fiercest opposition, most dreadful danger, he roused in them a reverence, an adoration, a deathless affection, a devotion to his person, which did not stop at the sacrifice of life itself. Even today, twenty centuries after his death, there is no single individual, though he be the

[1] This independence of Jesus had its root not in pride, but in his certainty of God and his absolute trust in him. He did not consult men but his Father, and when he rose from prayer, everything had been decided. The finest independence of feeling and action is the fruit of a life of prayerful humility. Cf. Robertson, Sermons, First Series, pp. 270f.

ruler of an empire, who could summon so great a host of ardent followers, ready for any sacrifice, as could Jesus. He was the greatest of leaders for he was the supreme inspirer of men. He was the supreme inspirer of men, because he, the greatest of them all, unreservedly gave himself for them, even to the death of the cross. This made him the unrivalled Captain of the hosts of righteousness, yesterday, today and forever.

The force of this Personality, as we have shown, has crossed all the oceans and streams down through all the centuries. How mighty must have been the power resident in him, who could create the initial impulse and supply the continuous energy for such a movement in our race!

Antitheses. Nothing is more impressive than the opposites in Jesus, except the nice equipoise which they always maintain. It is an iridescent character; you get a new and changing view from every different angle, and yet all is ever beautiful and harmonious. Most of these usually antithetic qualities have already been discussed, but we make bold to catalogue the most prominent of them at some risk of repetition, lest any reader

should fail to appreciate this noteworthy feature of the personality of Jesus.

He was a thorough Jew, had never known aught but Jewish influences, yet he was a Greek in his love of nature and his joy in life and an American in the strenuosity of his work and the practical cast of his mind. He was a child of his age, and yet has become the leader of every age.

He was a wonderful combination of the active and the passive virtues, the man of love who could not and would not avoid conflict, the Prince of Peace, who died bitterly hated by his many foes. In fact, he seemed to unite in himself the noblest traits of manhood and womanhood. He was strong without a trace of violence, and gentle without a trace of weakness. Love alone can explain this.

In him we find an extraordinary union of the contemplative and the active. He loved the crowd and the thronged street, yet he often stole away to the mountain to be alone with himself and God. He courted popularity, thrust himself on the attention of men, compelled them to hear his message, but, unlike Paul, was strangely reticent about his inner experience and men felt that

he died with secrets undisclosed. He was conscious of a fullness of life and a wealth of power, and yet his prayerfulness shows a sense of need which only God could supply. There was a secret life behind the scenes which is necessary to explain the Jesus whom the world knows.

He was refined and dignified, yet never cold and haughty. He was enthusiastic and sympathetic, yet always wise. He was deeply spiritual, but he was no fanatic, deadly in earnest in his hatred of sin, but no ascetic.

He made plans, looked out into the future, but within the outlines of his plans, he was a thorough-going opportunist. He showed the most remarkable breadth of conception, and yet bestowed the utmost attention on details. He talked with each casual inquirer as though that were his one business in life. Never was there a busier man, and yet he always had time.

No man ever gave himself more unreservedly to his career, and yet he showed a wonderful freedom from anxiety about the outcome. He understood how to wait, but he never hesitated. He knew his hour with unerring certainty and, when it came, he acted with amazing decisiveness.

He was a teacher, a preacher, a poet, but at the same time the most practical of empire builders.

He joined the authority of Lordship with the most genuine humility, the intrepid self-reliance of God's Anointed with implicit obedience to his Father.

His heart responded to all life's innocent pleasures, his joy was real and deep, yet he was the man of sorrows, the familiar friend of grief. He knew no antithesis between self-realization and self-denial. He found himself in self-giving. He grew stronger in spirit the more fully he devoted himself to others' good.

He was a natural conservative, yet a true progressive, and in many matters such a radical that the world has not yet caught up with him. He was an individualist of the most pronounced type, and yet he preached a social conception, the kingdom of God, as his highest ideal.

He put an almost equal emphasis on ethics and religion. He introduced a new and freer religion with a deeper and sterner morality. He preached both righteousness and love with the same insistence. His love for sinners was genuine

and amazing, yet he had no illusions about them and never hinted the slightest excuse for their sin.

Though he was unschooled, the world has gone to school to him, and that in the very highest studies. Though a common man, he has impressed the world as inexpressibly and uniquely great. "He seems to include and bring to perfection in himself every conceivable type of goodness." "The white light in him gathers up all the split and partial colors of our little spectrums." "All these opposites are only beams from the diamond of his soul," and the center of the diamond was the divine spirit that dwelt in him.

These varied and almost contrary qualities exactly fit Jesus to be the moral and spiritual leader of our race. They make him a sort of universal man. Each sex, each time of life, every age, every nation and every class finds in him something strangely familiar and genial, something to admire and love. The most opposite sects claim him with equal enthusiasm, and the most antipathetic men and women join in a common devotion to his person. The new world-life of our age, a united humanity with its new needs,

can discover in no other the diversity and universality of character which it demands, and can see in none but Jesus its Lord and Savior.

The most difficult ethical achievement is the maintenance of the moral balance in a many-sided personality, yet Jesus seems to have attained success at this point with perfect ease. With all these antithetic qualities, he never seems to be a complicated character, but always, at first view and indeed in the last analysis, impresses us with the simplicity, harmony and unity of his inner life, with the artlessness of his self-mastery, and the naturalness of his greatness.[1]

Goodness. There is a so-called goodness that men instinctively hate. All the satirists have levelled their shafts at it. The more virile and

[1] We quote Bushnell's famous paragraph on this topic. "Men undertake to be spiritual and they become ascetic; or, endeavoring to hold a liberal view of the comforts and pleasures of society, they are soon buried in the world, and slaves to its fashions; or, holding a scrupulous watch to keep out every particular sin, they become legal and fall out of liberty; or, charmed with the noble and heavenly liberty, they run to negligence and irresponsible living; so the earnest become violent, the fervent fanatical and censorious, the gentle waver, the firm turn bigots, the liberal grow lax, the benevolent ostentatious. Poor human infirmity can hold nothing steady. When the pivot of righteousness is broken, the scales must needs slide off their balance."

practical men are, the more they despise it. But ridicule grows dumb before the goodness of Jesus. His peerless character somehow never excites jealousy or dislike. Rather it is winsome and attractive. The bigger the man is, the surer he is to praise Jesus. We feel that to oppose Jesus is to judge ourselves. To be sure, Jesus had enemies, but they hated him because he antagonized their sins and interfered with their financial and popular influence. They objected to him not because he was too good, but because, thinking themselves the patterns of piety and the bulwarks of the state, they considered him the ally of irreligion and disorder. Some men today will take the same attitude towards Jesus for the same reason. He stands in their way. But, by their action, they only reveal to their fellows the smallness of their thoughts and the baseness of their hearts. The world has about made up its mind that Jesus is right.

Men like the perfect honesty of Jesus. He was simple as a child. He was grounded in truth. He was sound to the very core. He was absolutely genuine. He had a passion for righteousness and reality, a consuming hatred of artifi-

ciality and hypocrisy, a sternness against evil which is never obscured by his love for sinners. His character gives the impression of a singular and pellucid purity, no mixture of low with high motives, some form of selfishness pulling one way and love or duty pulling the other. In this man there is not a single false note, no morbidness, no vanity, no posing, no pretence, no false humility, no religious extravagance, no fanaticism or asceticism, no attempt to seem other than he was. In matters of duty, he never dreamed of compromise to avoid conflict. He thought it better to die than to sin, and this principle of his was put to a fiery test, when, in the question of the tribute money, he refused to equivocate with full knowledge of the consequences and threw away his life. He could endure crucifixion, but he could not shade the truth a single particle. This perfect sincerity is the secret of the spontaneity and naturalness of his life, of the straightforwardness of his course, of his fairness and candor in debate, of his constant appeal to reality, and gives him the charm which his disciples felt, when they said that he was full of grace and truth.

His goodness was not only founded on the bed-rock of honesty, but was utterly unselfish. His one object in life was to bring men into the blessing of loving obedience to the Father's will. This purpose of love ruled supreme, unrivalled by a thought of personal advantage or comfort or the praise of men. He held to this high aim in spite of all temptations to become involved in other matters, in spite of all the vicissitudes and disappointments of a very varied career, in spite of the fact that he discovered by and by that it led straight to the cross. His bold earnestness in his great enterprise made him deaf to all the allurements of self-seeking and gives him the love of all those who admire the brave and the true.

The goodness of Jesus attracts men because we feel that he dealt honestly with himself, that he practised what he preached, that his high ideals and stern demands made on others had their first application to his own life, that he was more exacting with himself than with any of his hearers. With this was naturally joined a sort of fairness in his treatment of sinners, a willingness to look at the matter from their point of view, a kindly appreciation of the first efforts to struggle up-

ward, however clumsy and feeble, a helpful hand stretched out gladly to aid every aspiration toward goodness. Matthew tells us that it was Jesus' custom to do his best for bruised reeds and not to throw them away as useless, to conserve the little heat left in the smoking wick till he could fan it again into flame. Such was the patience and tenderness of the Savior. There was nothing exclusive or narrow, then, about his goodness. Like the sunshine and the rain, it was for all. His great heart took in the weakest and the strongest, without any distinction whatever. Yet he never for a moment in false mercy let down the high standards of righteousness which he came to establish for mankind.

All this was possible because Jesus himself was involved in the moral struggle. He was tempted like as we are. Though he never sinned, his goodness grew deeper and richer year by year, and came at last to its finest maturity. It was therefore a real attainment, a real victory. If it had not been so, his goodness would belong, as it were, to another sphere external to us, he would be like the cold marble, icily faultless, a

perfect character fitted to chill us into discouragement and despair. But fighting our fight as he did, struggling with our foes on the same field where we find ourselves, and finally conquering with the weapons which we must use, he is to us the pioneer who leads us on, the victor who cheers us in the daily struggle, the Light and Hope of the World. He makes those who trust and follow him believe that, although they start at a lower level than he, they will win as he did.

Greatness. It seems almost unnecessary to give even a paragraph to the Greatness of Jesus. All that has been written combines to give us an overwhelming impression of it. Many great men are great in some one quality or aptitude, but the greatest men are great in more ways than one. So it was with Jesus. Among men he ranks as the greatest Character, the greatest Teacher, the greatest Organizer of righteousness, the greatest spiritual Inspirer and Leader of mankind. Among the noblest of his brethren he rises like Mount Everest in the Himalayas, supreme, unrivalled, alone.

Whether we consider the disadvantages of his

birth and environment compared with the vastness and permanence of his influence, the uniqueness of his spiritual experience, his mastery and originality in the sphere of religion and ethics, his preëminence as the Leader of humanity in purity and love, the fruitfulness of his thought and the inspiration of his personality for the uplifting and continuous progress of the individual and the race, his founding and perpetual revitalizing of the kingdom of God, or the perfection of his personal character, we must all agree that in Jesus we see the moral and spiritual Lord and Savior of mankind.

Loneliness. Jesus, however, paid the penalty of his supreme greatness by a supreme loneliness. Though he did his very best, he could not avoid being misapprehended. His parents thought him a strange child, and at the height of his popularity his mother and relatives came to seize him because they had concluded that he had gone crazy. His own brothers looked on him as an impractical dreamer. Neither the leaders nor the common people ever really comprehended his spiritual purposes, and this was only less true of his disciples. "Those who understood him best

understood him only half." [1] And we now see that it could not have been otherwise. In many respects, Jesus was at least twenty centuries ahead of his time. He belonged to that future age of spiritual glory of which he so often spoke. As he passed through the world in which he lived, he must have felt himself, in the last analysis, a stranger.

Finally, he found himself deserted, first by the people, who had once followed him with a superficial enthusiasm, and then by his own disciples. One of his dearest friends denied that he ever knew him, and he was openly rejected and crucified by the leaders of the nation which he came to save. Was there ever sorrow like this sorrow, a cup of tragic grief more bitter than this? If Jesus had been by instinct a recluse or one of those stern, cold characters who prefer to walk alone, this spiritual isolation could have been more easily borne. But Jesus was the very friendliest of men, he had a great, sensitive heart, he lived in the sunshine of love. To such a man,

[1] This view of the matter suggests that, instead of giving us an exaggerated picture, the evangelists never did Jesus justice. In his case it is probably literally true that the half was never told. Why should we not understand Jesus better than the men of his time? Our time is largely the resultant of his life and teaching.

profound loneliness must have been the keenest of trials. He walked among men, the crowds pressed upon him, he journeyed surrounded by his friends, and yet he was alone. He was cut off from the sympathy for which his whole nature cried out, and which was indeed necessary to the immediate success of his great life purpose. Here is the real pathos of this wonderful character, the pathos of supreme greatness in a little world.

We have now come to the innermost shrine of this personality, that sacred sphere of reserve and mystery which Jesus could not reveal, and even if we knock, we cannot enter. "No man knows me but the Father," said Jesus (Matthew 11: 27). "He has a name written which no one knows but he himself" (Rev. 19: 12). In this hidden life, Jesus was alone, but alone with God. This is his Holy of Holies. Here is the treasure house of his power, and the fountain, whence flow the streams of divine salvation to all the world.

This unshared and solitary elevation of character should not repel men, for, after all, it is because Jesus is above us that he can help us up. It is because he is stronger than we, that we may flee to him in every hour of need.

CHAPTER IX

THE FINALITY OF JESUS

THAT was a great day for the human race, when the last touches were put upon the glorious Parthenon, and architecture came to its perfection of beauty. That was a great day when Raphael completed the Sistine Madonna and painting reached its highest mark. Those were great days when men invented the steam engine, the telegraph, the electric light and the telephone.

But above all other days was the supreme day when at last the Perfect Man appeared.[1] Cicero in his Tusculan Disputations tells us that the ancient thinkers often discussed what sort of man the just man would be; but nobody discusses that now, for the ideal of humanity has been revealed in Jesus. The wonderful dreams of the world's philosophies and religions have come true at last in the Man of Nazareth. All

[1] For extended proof of the moral perfection of Jesus, see pp. 43–46.

their prophecies, longings and imaginings find their fulfilment and more in him.

All attempts to draw a rival character are hopeless failures. Nietzsche's Superman repels all the finer feelings of mankind, and an attempt at its realization would drown civilization in blood. The glory of the Cæsars and the Napoleons, the Rothschilds and the Vanderbilts fades. Even great benefactors of the human race, like Washington and Lincoln, Jenner and Pasteur, are judged and honored only by their likeness to Jesus. Even those who are not his followers find in him the norm of conduct. John Stuart Mill, who did not pretend to be a Christian, says, "Religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching upon Jesus as the ideal representative and guide of humanity; nor even now would it be easy, even for an unbeliever, to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete than the endeavor so to live that Christ would approve our lives." More universally than we usually think, this sentiment has become an essential of the mental furnishing of the non-christian part of Christendom. Jesus, or the

more generalized Spirit of Christ, is really the moral standard of the whole Western World, accepted by the ordinary man as unconsciously and absolutely as the air or the sunlight. It is indisputably the cornerstone of Christian civilization, "the undying root of all that is best in modern life."

The magnitude of this fact can possibly be best appreciated if we consider what the loss of this ideal would mean, if indeed such loss were thinkable. It would set back the clock of spiritual progress twenty centuries. It would plunge the nations into moral chaos and disaster. It would bring a universal sense of an overwhelming and irreparable world-calamity. Nothing can be imagined that would so deeply and permanently sadden mankind.[1]

We cannot, however, rest the finality of Jesus on his moral perfection alone, though this is and must ever be the starting point. We may conceive a morally perfect man, who would never be known beyond the limits of his Nazareth. All

[1] Compare Romanes' Thoughts on Religion, p. 29. When Romanes gave up the thought of Christ and God, he "suffered the sharpest pang of which his nature was susceptible" and "the universe for him lost its soul of loveliness."

morally perfect men are not necessarily identical in character. Indeed the probabilities are that each one would be different, just as no two exquisite sunsets are alike. Filled with the optimism of Jesus, we may go a step further and ask whether the world is not likely to see perfect characters produced by the Spirit in the future, especially in those days when "God's will is done on earth even as it is done in heaven."

Yet, even so, Jesus would still be "the first born among many brethren" (Romans 8: 29), the pioneer, the road breaker of our salvation (Hebrews 2: 10), our forerunner into the holiest (Hebrews 6: 20). Though there may be varieties of perfect men, he will always be the pattern and the prototype, the leader and perfecter of faith. Just because he came first, he occupies the unique place, which can never be taken from him. In the course of our history there may appear many Americans as great, wise and patriotic as Washington, but no other can ever be the Father of his Country. So Jesus, because he was the Beginning of Christianity, the Founder of the Kingdom of God, has an inalienable preëminence.

But Jesus has a preëminence far beyond this,

a uniqueness which guarantees his finality. And here we should proceed slowly and circumspectly, considering all the factors of the problem. The quiet, morally perfect man whom we have already imagined, would by his very nature desire that other men should enter into his life of blessing and, more, would have so much of the Savior-heart that he would actively try to bring them into it. But we can well conceive that his efforts might be confined to a narrow circle. It is significant here that Jesus himself did not work outside of Nazareth until he was about thirty years of age. But Jesus felt a call to a wider service, the call to bring salvation to the nation and the world. This, as has been well said, was the greatest thought which ever entered a human mind and left it sane. Nor was this all, nor indeed the most important thing. The great point is that he felt in himself the resources adequate to so great a work, and that this self-judgment has been justified by history. To moral perfection, to the Savior-heart, was added not only the wide outlook, but ability, capacity, power. In the end it all comes back to the greatness of his personality, the mighty strength of his soul,

the breadth and depth, yes, the size of the man. And this was natural to him. He was made that way. It was enduement or endowment, as you please. Peter tells the whole story, "God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power."

Of this most significant of all human facts twenty centuries are the proof. Jesus changed the whole course of history. He created a new sense of God, a new type of man, a new social order and a new world of life and freedom. It is the best world men have ever known, but Jesus insistently demands that it must be far better still. And Jesus has done all this by moral and spiritual means, by giving his first attention to the spirit of the individual. He actually saves the individual man from selfishness, sensuality, pride, greed and hate, and saves him to a life of righteousness and unselfish love. It is not only that, if men will follow his prescriptions, they will be made over, but he himself seems in some strange way to be the embodiment of the power which urges men and the world on to such a life of loving obedience and service.

Moreover, he does all that religion can be asked

to do. He brings men to God. He is the Way, the Truth and the Life. Yes, better still, he brings God to men. He who yields to the spell of his personality, surrenders to his love, unites his life to that of Jesus, gets his spirit and shares his purpose, that man, working with him, finds God in Jesus, sees the Father in him, gains his unshakable faith, and enters into communion with the Most High.

And Jesus grows on the world. Pharisees, philosophers, satirists, atheists, critics and psychologists, have all had their day with Jesus, but every new attack makes Jesus greater and stronger. Old conceptions of him may disappear, but they only give place to larger, juster and profounder views of his character and significance. As Browning sings,

"That one Face, far from vanish, rather grows,
Or decomposes but to recompose,
Becomes my universe that feels and knows."

Yes, Jesus grows on the world. The more men study him, the more he impresses them. Rival parties and classes claim him as their leader and authority. Nothing against which

he pronounced has any future in our new world. More and more it is seen that in him are the principles of social regeneration and that he alone can unite all men, and that only in himself. If the world is to be saved, he must be its Savior. And so he gains a universal significance. He leaves the stage of the historical and the personal and becomes an ideal, an atmosphere, a working principle, the basis of the coming age, which all far-seeing men perceive is to be more Christian than any which have preceded it. The world has not yet outgrown Jesus. It is just now at last catching his real meaning.[1] He still leads us on.

In our marvelous world-history, Jesus is the greatest marvel of all. No one can ever take his place. All future saviors will acknowledge his supremacy and finality. His energy seems exhaustless and indeed increasing.

[1] A single illustration. Fosdick quotes Dr. Samuel J. Barrows as saying, "We speak of Howard, Livingston, Beccaria and others as great penologists, who have profoundly influenced modern life; but the principles enunciated and the methods introduced by Jesus seem to me to stamp him as the greatest penologist of any age. He has needed to wait, however, nearly twenty centuries to find his principles and methods recognized in modern law and penology."

Men have always asked and are still asking the secret of this personality. It will never be wholly revealed. Paul's explanation was that *God* was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and that the light of the knowledge of the glory of God shines on us from the face of Jesus. The Church in her enthusiasm for her Lord and Savior has tried to say this better and define it more narrowly. Whether it has altogether succeeded in the task may be a matter of debate, but one thing is perfectly plain:—This Jesus, so strangely and uniquely full of God, is Lord in a sphere beyond the reach of our highest thought. He therefore demands and deserves the wonder, reverence, love and supreme devotion of every human being.

APPENDIX

AN OUTLINE OF JESUS' CAREER

PART I. The Life before the Ministry.
B. C. 5 or 6—Fall of A. D. 26.
Principal Events. 1. The Birth at Bethlehem.
2. The Quiet Years at Nazareth.

Part II. The Preliminary Events of the Ministry.
Fall of A. D. 26—Passover, April 11, 27.
Principal Events. 1. The Ministry of John the Baptist.
2. The Baptism of Jesus.
3. The Temptation of Jesus.
4. The First Disciples.

PART III. The Early Judean Ministry.
Passover, April 11, 27—December 27.
Principal Events. 1. First Cleansing of the Temple.
2. Interview with Nicodemus.
3. Coöperation with John in his Ministry in Judea.

PART IV. The Galilean Ministry.
December 27—Passover, April 18, 29.
Principal Events (mostly topical).
1. Jesus' Itinerant Preaching of the Kingdom and Miracles attract Great Multitudes.

PART IV. The Galilean Ministry—*Continued.*

2. Jesus' Calling, Teaching and Organization of his Disciples.
3. The Scribes and Pharisees increasingly hostile.
4. The Crisis at Capernaum.
   a. The Mission of the Twelve.
   b. The Feeding of the 5,000.
   c. The Break with the People at Capernaum.
   d. The Break with the Pharisees on Eating with Unwashed Hands.

PART V. The Retirement in the North.

Passover, April 18, 29—November 29.

Principal Events. 1. Instruction of Disciples, ending in Peter's Confession and Jesus' Prophecy of his Death.
2. The Transfiguration and Jesus' Resolution to go up to his Death at Jerusalem.

PART VI. The Perean Ministry.

November 29—Sunday, April 2, 30.

The Perean Ministry was much like the Galilean, except that all was briefer, more pointed and more solemn.

PART VI. The Perean Ministry—*Continued.*

The data are too uncertain to justify a list of principal events. Suffice it to say that at the close Jesus goes up to Jerusalem from Perea by way of Jericho.

PART VII. The Passion Week.

April 2, 30—April 9, 30.

Principal Events. 1. The Triumphal Entry.
2. Second Cleansing of the Temple.
3. Conflicts with the Jewish Leaders.
4. The Last Supper.
5. Gethsemane and the Betrayal.
6. The Jewish Trial.
7. The Roman Trial.
8. The Crucifixion and Burial.

PART VIII. The Forty Days.

April 9, 30—May 18, 30.

Principal Events. 1. The Resurrection Morning.
2. The Appearances during Forty Days.
3. The Ascension.

(NOTE.—This chronological scheme is based on the supposition of a three year ministry. I am almost, though not quite, persuaded to accept a two year ministry. But such a change would not alter the order or relative importance of these events. The substantial historicity of the Gospel of John is also presupposed. My acknowledgments are due to Stevens and Burton's Harmony of the Gospels, though I have freely amended their outline.)

INDEX

Adaptation of Christianity, 9 f.
Aggressiveness of Jesus, 138 f., 169 f.
Antitheses of his Character, 195–200
Apocalyptic and its Influence on Jesus, 29 f., 62, 84–92
Authority of Jesus, 114, 177 f., 193 ff., 217

Balance of Jesus, 178 ff., 198 f.
Baptism of Jesus, 38–41
Bringer of Salvation, 57 f.
Broadening Outlook of Christianity, 8 f.

Cæsarea Philippi, Confession at, 37 f., 79 ff.
Call of Jesus, 51–55
Centurion, Gentile, 156
Certainty of Jesus, 168 f.
Character, 130
Character of Jesus, 166–208
Church, Jesus' View of it, 149–154, 159
Clean and Unclean, 79, 105 f., 109
Clouds of Heaven, 89 ff.
Coming, Second, 83–92, 161 f., 165
Common People, 30 f., 125, 140 f., 183 f.
Community, The New, 145 f., 151 ff., 159 f.
Constructiveness of Jesus, 187 f.
Conversions, 11 f.
Courage of Jesus, 169 ff.
Covenant, 145
Covetousness, 131
Crisis at Capernaum, 78 f.
Cross, 146–149

Death of Jesus, 80, 82 f., 135, 143–149, 163
Deserted, Jesus, 207 f.
Devout, The, 31
Dignity of Jesus, 192 f.
Disadvantages of Jesus, 2 f., 178
Divorce, 108
Doing God's Will, 129 f.
Duties, Religious, 129

Economic Situation of Palestine, 24
End of the World, 131 ff.

Faith, 122
Fatherhood of God, 48 f., 103, 117 f.
Feeding of Five Thousand, 78 f.

Fellowship with God, Jesus', 47 ff., 146 ff., 163, 166 ff.
Finality of Jesus, 209–217
Forgiveness, 122
Founder of Kingdom, 58 f., 85 f., 137 f.

Gentile Mission, 143, 154–159
Gethsemane, 146 f.
God, 117 ff., 126
Goodness of Jesus, 200–205
Grace of God, 102 f.
Greatness of Jesus, 205 f.
Greek Influences, 23, 25
Growth of Conception of Messiahship, 41–56

Healings, 140, 191
Healthiness of Jesus, 190 f.
Historical Situation of Jesus, 23–33
Honesty of Jesus, 65, 166, 201 f.
Humility of Jesus, 177 f.

Inadequacy of Messianic Title, 96
Independence of Jesus, 180 f., 194
Independence, Spiritual, 125, 182
Influence of Jesus:
  On the Ages, 1, 4–18, 195, 215 f.
  On Christianity, 7–10
  On Contemporaries, 3 f., 188 f.
Insight of Jesus, 112, 183 ff.

Jewish Trial, 36 f., 94 f.
John the Baptist, 32 f., 39 f., 78, 80 f., 102, 150 f., 153
Joy of Jesus, 171 f.
Judaism and the Disciples, 149–154
Judea and Galilee Contrasted, 24 f., 99
Judge of Men, 59

Kingdom of God, 58 f., 71–75, 83 f., 116, 118–121, 131 f., 134 f., 138, 156 f., 159 ff., 163 f.

Last Supper, 144 ff.
Legalism and Jesus, 26 f., 97–110, 168
Life, Inner, 124, 181 f.
Life, The New, 121–135
Loneliness of Jesus, 206 ff.
Lordship of Jesus, 177 f., 193 ff., 198, 217
Love, 122, 126 ff.
Love of Jesus, 126 f., 140–143, 172–178, 203 f.

Man, 125
Martyrdoms, Testimony of, 12 ff.
Messianic Hope, 28 f., 34 f., 60 ff.
Messianism and Jesus, 34–96, 134 f.
Mill, J. S., 45, 210
Mission of Jesus, 53 f., 64, 152, 160, 168

Moral Advance due to Jesus, 14 ff.

Old Testament and Jesus, 49 f., 98 f., 106–110, 154 f.
Opportunism of Jesus, 68, 197
Optimism of Jesus, 173
Originality of Jesus, 20 f., 111–114
Outline of Jesus' Career, 219 ff.

Parties, Jewish, 25–31
Pedagogic Difficulties of Jesus, 68 ff.
Perean Ministry, 92
Perfection of Jesus, 43–46, 209–212
Personality of Jesus, 18–22, 65, 200, 208, 212–215
Peter's Confession. See Cæsarea Philippi
Pharisees, 26 f., 97 ff., 100 f., 103–106, 150–153
Political Difficulties of Jesus, 71
Popularity of Jesus, 76 f.
Power of Jesus, 188–194, 212–215. See Influence of Jesus
Practicality of Jesus, 185 f.
Preaching of Jesus, 139 f.
Presence, Continuing, 164 f.
Proportion, Jesus' Sense of, 113, 182 f.
Publicans, 141 f.

Reality, Jesus' Appeal to, 184, 187 f.
Recent Triumphs of Christianity, 16 ff.
Refinement of Jesus, 176
Religion, 102 f.
Repentance, 121, 123
Representative, God's, 56 f., 185 f.
Reserve, Messianic, 71–75, 77 f., 86 f.
Respect for Personality, Jesus', 173, 182
Resurrection of Jesus, 162 ff.
Revolutionary? Was Jesus a, 180 f.
Righteousness, 121
Rousseau, 45, 146

Sabbath, 105, 108
Sacrifice, 145 f.
Sadducees, 25 f.
Salvation, 12, 57 f., 123, 136
Secret of Jesus, 208, 217
Self-criticism and Self-purification of Christianity, 7 f.
Self-mastery of Jesus, 190 f.
Separation from Judaism, 149–154
Seriousness of Jesus, 113, 120
Service, 128
Sexual Purity, 128
Sinners, 31, 141
Social Attitude, 130
Social Nature of Jesus, 171 f., 175 f.
Son of Man, 85 ff.
Spirit of Jesus, our Ideal, 210 f.
State, The, 131

Success, Immediate, of Jesus, 75 f., 82
Syrophœnician, 143, 156

Teaching of Jesus, Esp. 111–136:
Manner of, 103 f., 114 ff., 185 f.
Originality of, 20 f., 111–114
On Character, 130
On Covetousness, 131
On Doing God's Will, 129 f.
On Duties, Religious, 129
On End of the World, 131 f.
On Faith, 122
On Forgiveness, 122
On God, 117 ff., 126
On Grace, 102 f.
On Independence, Spiritual, 125
On Inner Life, 124
On the Kingdom. See Kingdom
On Love, 122, 126 ff.
On Man, 125
On the New Life, 121–135
On Religion, 102 f.
On Repentance, 121, 123
On Righteousness, 121
On Salvation, 123
On Service, 128
On Social Attitude, 130
On the State, 131
On Truth, 124 f.
On Wealth, 131 ff.
On World-renunciation, 132 ff.
Temptation of Jesus, 38, 65–68, 204 f.
Tradition, Scribal, 104 f.
Tribute-money, 93 f.
Triumphal Entry, 37, 92 f.
Truth, 124 f.
Twelve, The, 151 ff.
Two-nature Theory, 41 ff.

Universal Man, Jesus, 199 f., 216
Universality of Kingdom, 156 f.
Universality of Jesus' Ministry, 140–143, 174
Unselfishness of Jesus, 176 ff., 203

Vicarious Suffering, 148
Victory, Final, 161 f., 165, 170 f.
View of Future of his Work, 149–165
Vitality of Jesus, 164, 189 ff.

Wealth, 131 ff.
"Why hast Thou Forsaken Me?" 146 ff.
Wisdom of Jesus, 178–188
Work of Jesus, 137–149
World-renunciation, 132 ff.

Zealots, 27 f., 34, 61 f., 78 f., 93 f.

THE following pages contain advertisements of a few of the Macmillan books on kindred subjects

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

The Development of the Christian Religion

By Shailer Mathews, Author of "The Church and the Changing Order," "The Gospel and the Modern Man," etc. Cloth, 12mo. $1.50 net.

Dr. Mathews here enters upon the little explored territory of social theology. His general position is that the scientific theologian should approach his task through the social sciences, particularly history, rather than through philosophy. The main thesis of the book is that doctrines grow out of the same social forces as express themselves in other forms of life. Dr. Mathews finds seven creative social minds and treats the development of the various Christian doctrines as they have emerged from the earlier of these minds and must be created by our modern social mind. Such a treatment of Christian doctrine serves to make theology a vital rather than a merely scholastic or ecclesiastical matter. The study of the social minds of the past, with their creative influence on Christianity, gives a point of view for the study of the intellectual needs of today's religion. This volume conserves the values of the religious thinking of the past, and is, in addition, a positive force in the reconstruction of the religious thinking of the day.

The Christian Life in the Modern World

By Francis G. Peabody, Author of "Jesus Christ and the Social Question," etc. Cloth, 12mo.

The purpose of this book is to meet the increasing impression that Christian idealism is inapplicable to the conditions of modern life and to indicate the terms and conditions on which these ideals may be perpetuated. There are chapters on The Practicability of the Christian Life, The Christian Life and the Modern Family, The Christian Life and the Business World, The Christian Life and the Making of Money, The Christian Life and the Using of Money, The Christian Life and the Modern State and The Christian Life and the Christian Church.

PUBLISHED BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Avenue
New York

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

DR. RAUSCHENBUSCH'S NEW WORK

Social Redemption

By WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH, Author of "Christianizing the Social Order," "Christianity and the Social Crisis," etc. Cloth, 12mo. $1.50 net.

Dr. Rauschenbusch here pursues to further conclusions the general theme of his previous books. He deals less, however, in this volume with economics and more with the problem of how the new social convictions may be practically embodied in the life and thought of the church so that they shall not be intruders but members of the household. Among the questions which he raises and which, in a measure, he answers, are the following: How Can the New Social Feeling of Responsibility Be Utilized in Evangelistic Appeals, How Will the New Ideas of the Social Sin and Social Redemption Affect the Whole Scheme of Theology, the Doctrine of Atonement, for Example, How Can the Religious Feelings Called Out by the New Social Vision Be Expressed and Satisfied in the Prayers, the Hymns and the Liturgy, Ought There to Be Sacraments of Social Redemption Just as There Are Religious Sacraments of Individual Redemption. These represent very live issues and Dr. Rauschenbusch's ability to cope with them has been amply demonstrated.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue

New York

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

Modern Religious Movements in India

By J. W. Farquhar.
Illustrated. Cloth, 8vo. $2.50 net.

This comprehensive survey of present day religious tendencies in India is of tremendous importance and significance to every student of religion. In it are described the various new religious organizations which, under the impact of the West, have arisen in India during the past century. The Brahma, Prarthana, Arya, and Deva Samajes, the Ramakrishna Movement, Theosophy, the Bharata Dharma Mahamandal, the Caste and Sect Conferences, the Social Reform Movement, and the efforts of Muhammedans, Parsis, Jains and Sikhs to accommodate their systems to the needs of modern times are all dealt with in turn. Portraits of the leaders are included in the volume. The original basis of this work is the Hartford Lamson Lectures on the Religions of the World, though in its printed form the material has been revised and enlarged.

Vital Elements of Preaching

By Arthur S. Hoyt, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in Auburn Theological Seminary, and Author of "The Work of Preaching" and "The Preacher." Cloth, 12mo. $1.50 net.

The Work of Preaching, one of Dr. Hoyt's former books, deals with the sources and formation of the sermon for the present age. *The Preacher*, still another of his works, places emphasis upon a vital spiritual personality in giving the message. This volume touches the temper of the man both as to the truth and the lives of his hearers. "Preaching," writes Dr. Hoyt in his preface, "is a social virtue. Nothing can be more fundamental to the preacher than his humanity. The deepest needs and desires of the age must be felt in his life if his word interprets aright the gospel of the new man."

The author here discusses the psychology of preaching, though without formal and philosophic analysis. He always has in mind the question, How shall we speak so as to help men into the largest life?

PUBLISHED BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Avenue
New York

Social Christianity in the Orient: The Story of a Man, a Mission and a Movement

By JOHN E. CLOUGH. Written down for him by his wife, EMMA RAUSCHENBUSCH CLOUGH. Illustrated. Cloth, 12mo.

"The Christian world was thrilled over thirty years ago by the story of Dr. Clough's work. Now for the first time we have opportunity to study his methods, to get at the social, economic and religious principles which lay behind it."—W. H. Faunce, D.D., *President of Brown University.*

"Dr. Clough was one of the founders of the modern era in missions. Before him the purpose largely had been to produce a western type of Christianity in Oriental lands. Dr. Clough caught a vision of the transforming of peoples. Upon the foundation of the crude village organization which he found he built a Christianity of Oriental type. His method of baptizing converts from heathenism, thousands at a time, on credible profession of faith in Christ, has profoundly affected the methods of Christianity in India and other lands. In this book we have a graphic description of his ideas and methods and experiences."—E. F. Merriam, D.D., *Managing Editor of the Watchman-Examiner.*

The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Democracy

By HENRY C. VEDDER, Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary and Author of "Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus." "The Reformation in Germany," etc. Cloth, 12mo. $1.50 net.

"We need a reconstructed theology. The theology of all churches has been dominated by monarchical ideas; it needs to be recast in the mould of democracy; it has been permeated with ideas of social privilege such as were unfavorable when aristocracy ruled the world; it needs to be restated in terms of equal rights." These sentences from Dr. Vedder's preface at once show his viewpoint. The Gospel and the Awakening Church, The Problem of Social Justice, The Woman Problem, The Problem of the Child, The Problem of the Slums, The Problem of Vice, The Problem of Crime, The Problem of Disease, The Problem of Poverty, The Problem of Lawlessness—these are the topics of the ten chapters. The book is undoubtedly one of the most important contributions to the study of present day religion that has yet been published.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York

RD-107

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: July 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING
NOV 81
ST. AUGUSTINE
FLA.
32084

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 227 676 8